The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIX, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1948

CONTENTS

The Financial Problem . . *Msgr. John L. Belford* 161

Mission Theology and Common Sense
Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R. 168

The Intellectual and Moral Causes of Unbelief
John Gregory Clancy 179

Recent Publications on the Psalms. Part II
Edward P. Arbez, S.S. 187

Prefrontal Lobotomy: Its Present Moral Aspect
Patrick O'Brien, C.M. 196

The Church and the World . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 202

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

A Recent Decree of the Holy Office 215

The Priest and Divorced Persons 217

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Easter and the Passover 220

Ringing the Bell at Mass 221

Must the Tabernacle Veil be Opaque? 221

ANALECTA 223

BOOK REVIEWS

Growth or Decline? The Church Today,
by Emmanuel Cardinal Suhard 229

Twenty-Four American Cardinals,
by Brendan A. Finn 231

The Bible and Early Man, *by Humphrey J. T. Johnson* . 237

A Manual of Prayers and Services for the Use of Romanian-American Catholics of the Byzantine Rite . . . 239

TO INCREASE prices or to make a sincere effort to hold the line against the inflationary tide — that is the question! Because of the good will at stake, we have elected to pursue the latter course.
For example, Allen Silk Mills has just been obliged to grant another substantial wage increase. Like the one before it, we are absorbing it. Human nature being what it is, this policy will not receive half the publicity that would be accorded an announcement of a general price increase.
We do hope, however, that those in the trade who hailed us as benefactors when we took care of their needs when fabrics were in short supply, will be mindful of these Allen policies now that normal production of fabrics has been attained. The prevailing prices on all Allen Fabrics themselves reflect the sincere efforts we are making to combat the deplorable inflationary trend.

"Buy American"

ALLEN SILK MILLS
Manufacturers
Charles M. Muench, *Executive Director*
140 West 31st Street **New York 1, N. Y.**
VESTMENT FABRICS BANDINGS
DRAPERY FABRICS EMBLEMS
Sold exclusively through Church Goods Dealers

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM

Away back in the nineties, when The Catholic University of America was in swaddling clothes, there came to Caldwell Hall for a visit the famous Father Orr of Cambridge, Mass. The visit of this lovable old man, who was always called "Billy," synchronized with a meeting of representatives of several colleges and universities. These distinguished men gathered to discuss some of the educational problems. They were all specialists.

Bishop Keane, the rector of Catholic University, was an old friend of Father Orr, who was no mean benefactor of the University. He insisted that the visitor from Boston should dine with the company.

At table, "Billy" was seated between a psychologist from Yale and an anthropologist from Chicago. Naturally the conversation lagged. Finally, one of the professors asked Father Orr, "may I ask, what is your specialty?" Billy hesitated an instant and, then in the rich brogue which made him famous, replied: "My specialty is raising money for church purposes without giving scandal."

The man who can do that ought to have a chair at the University. All the deacons should be sent to him for training. In fact, it might be worth while to send him through the nation to instruct the old and the young in his "specialty."

Financial problems are common. Who has not had one? They are individual as well as collective. They confront the single as well as the married. They affect the laborer as well as the priest.

Hard as it is to solve the problem, it is much harder to solve it for a congregation than it is to solve it for an individual or even for a family. The more numerous the congregation, the harder is it to interest all the members or to secure the co-operation which makes success.

Some do not like to part with their money. When they do part with it, they want some tangible return. They spend freely for amusement and for comfort, but they are not so ready to spend for religion.

Collection baskets are not an inspiring sight. The average basket contains a few bills, a dozen quarters, maybe a hundred dimes and several hundred nickels—a total of maybe $40 or $50 contributed by 500 or 700 people.

Of course, there are other sources of revenue, but in most churches, the Sunday collections are the chief source of income.

Some who would not hesitate to hand a beggar a dollar are accustomed to put a dime or even a nickel in the basket.

When we seek the reason for this, we find it in the fact that the basket conceals the gift. Hence, the detestable practice which leads some priests to go around with the basket. They do it because they obtain more money. But they lose something more precious than money—the respect of the people.

Only a genius can solve the financial problem which confronts every pastor. Now, genius is rare. Some geniuses are born like poets; but most of them are made. The process of making involves much practice and many failures. Many a priest who shines in the sacred sciences is a dismal failure when it comes to raising money for his work. He may be able to persuade his people to lead a holy life, but he cannot convince them that it takes money to build and maintain a church or school.

When he goes into a parish, the pastor ought to make it clear that he has come to work with and for the people. But he ought to speak plainly about the cost of religious service. If he would devote one Sunday to this, it would save him much effort and no end of worry. Let him say: "This is your church. I am merely your agent or treasurer. The bills are yours. I pay them with your money. I am here today. Tomorrow, I may be in some other parish. While I am here, I will do all I can for you. But I cannot make a dollar worth anything more than one dollar. I have spent years learning how to teach you truth and how to administer the sacred rites of the Church. Building and collecting are really not my work. But I am willing to do it if you will help me. Please remember, it does not matter to me whether you give or what you give. I am entitled to my salary and house expenses. The rest of your contributions will be used for the church and school."

This is a solid platform. Stand on it. Stick to it. It will win. It may take time, but it will finally convince everyone except those whom nothing can convince.

Some priests say, "Don't talk money; care for the souls of your people; where there is spiritual health, there will be material success."

That is not true. We must till our field. We must plant good seed. Some of that seed is spiritual. But some is material. We must find money to carry on our work. The task is not pleasant,

but it is necessary. For some priests, begging has a strange fascination. It grips them and induces them to become chronic scolds or constitutional peddlers. It turns them away from the higher and better things and buries them in schemes, drives, entertainments, and envelopes.

Nor are these priests without some excuse. The popular idea of a successful pastor is his ability to raise money. He may be learned, pious, cultured, but if he does not raise all the money the parish needs, he will be counted a failure. This estimate is not confined to the people. Many priests adopt it and sometimes bishops are found who do not reject it.

One of the effects of this fallacy is extravagant exaggeration of its importance. It leads young priests to cultivate the art of making effective financial appeals at the expense of the really worth-while studies of their vocation. It also leads to vulgarity and coarseness in and out of the pulpit and it makes the observance of religious duties odious to the best element of the laity.

Many causes contribute to this financial preoccupation and undue insistence. The first is the mistake of contracting a debt out of proportion to the means of the people. This is done when the pastor buys much land or land which is too expensive.

Some priests are foolishly ambitious. They try to build a church too large or too costly. Some are victims of incompetent or designing architects, who care more for their reputation as artists than they do for the welfare of their clients. They prepare plans, which they know they cannot execute for the sum the pastor has named as the maximum, and then they persuade him to proceed with the work and contract a debt which entails years of struggle. This mistake has cost many a good priest his health, and not infrequently, it has made him lose his priestly spirit.

There are times when we have to "talk money." When that time comes, do it as well as you can. Prepare your talk as carefully as you would prepare a paper for the Conference. The object of that talk is to convince the people that you need, not money in general, but a certain sum for a certain purpose. Tell them plainly what you need and why. Show them that you are not unreasonable. Point out how they can comply with your demands. Be a good business man, but do not fail to be a gentleman. You are asking them to help you. Do not lose your temper. Do not abuse them. Do not single out any individual for reproach. Tell the truth clearly,

earnestly, courteously. If you do that, no one can find fault with you and you will secure what you seek. It pays to tell the truth in matters of business. It will not fail in matters of religion.

But do not make the fatal mistake of talking money often. *Assueta vilescunt.* When people hear the same old song once a month, they pay no attention to it. In fact, they soon learn it by heart and the only effect it has is irritation. Besides, frequent and ill-considered talk of this kind has done and is now doing irreparable harm to religion.

There is much religious indifference even among Catholics in this country. In fact, religious indifference is increasing. Year after year, we lose thousands who give up first their Easter Communion, then Sunday Mass. These losses are not confined to young people who have not had the advantage of a religious education. They include many who have been educated in our parish schools, in our academies and, sad to say, in our colleges.

While some of these losses are due to hostility, most of them are due to ignorance. The stray sheep wander away because they do not know the value, the beauty, the comfort, the security of their Father's House.

No one who really knows what Holy Communion is needs urging to receive Our Lord. No one who really knows what Mass is will miss the holy sacrifice if he can find a way to attend it.

Ignoti nulla cupido. The heart cannot love what the intellect does not apprehend. No one loves what he does not know and no one will practice a religion which he does not know and love.

Ignorance is the root of religious indifference here as elsewhere. Most of our people confine their knowledge to the bare essentials of religion. They never progress beyond what they learned in the elementary school or the high school. They never read a book of doctrine, history, or liturgy. Once they have passed the examination for Confirmation, they consider their religious education finished. They studiously avoid lectures and sermons on doctrinal subjects. When they go to Mass, they choose a low Mass at which there can be not more than a five or ten minute sermon. They even make sermons and preaching the butt of their sarcasm and ridicule, and they do not spare criticism in the presence of their non-Catholic friends. The result of all this is contempt for the Church, the clergy and all ecclesiastical regulation. "Lent is a dead letter; the Precepts of the Church are obsolete; marriage is a mat-

ter of personal opinion and the use of marriage is nobody's business!"

But why are these people so ignorant? The usual answer can be given. They do not study. They will not learn. But we know it is the duty of the Church to teach and the duty of the people to listen. Can there be anything stronger than St. Paul's advice to Timothy: "Preach the word! Be instant in season and out of season: reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine. For there shall come a time when they will not endure sound doctrine but according to their own desires, they will reap to themselves teachers, having itching ears and will turn away their hearing from the truth, but will be turned into fables."

Of course, we have a law which requires us to give a short instruction at the low Masses on Sundays and holydays. We have fine programs. But many of us are like the man who has an excellent filing system and does not use it.

Sunday is a busy day. In most of our city parishes there are five or six Masses. At some of these Masses so many people receive Holy Communion that there is scant time for the instruction and announcements. The time allowed for Mass is about forty-five minutes. One congregation must leave the church before the other can enter. The Masses may not conflict. It will not do to keep the people waiting on the street. In bad weather that would be cruel as well as foolish.

To maintain an orderly schedule, only forty-five minutes can be given for each service. It takes twenty-five minutes to say Mass with becoming reverence and ten to fifteen minutes to give Holy Communion. That leaves a bare five or ten minutes for the announcements and the instruction. But who can give a clear convincing, interesting instruction in these few minutes? We are told that Monsabré and Gratry did it day after day in Notre Dame at Paris. But they were geniuses and genius is rare even in America. The largest diocese is indeed fortunate which has even a few priests who can give good instructions. Most of us do not know how. Few try to learn how. We just give the usual, unprepared, undigested series of commonplace remarks. If time presses, we omit the instruction. The announcements are never omitted. In them, the feature is money in some form. If it does not concern the collection of the day, it will refer to one that has just been made or one that will soon come. It may refer to a fair or card party or

some similar form of so-called entertainment. In many parishes only one Sunday in the month is free from "a word" about the monthly collection. Today, we announce it for next Sunday. That Sunday, we urge it, explain it and comment upon the results of previous efforts. The Sunday after, we give the result and praise or blame, thank or scold, according to circumstances. Three Sundays having been used for Mammon, there is but one left for God. Is it strange that the people know so little about doctrine and knowing so little, fall away?

Surely, the Lord does not want us to starve our flock. We have been sent to feed the sheep. Are we not guilty of flinging them husks rather than the life-giving food of the Gospel?

Absorption in merely material things undermines the priestly spirit. It disposes us to appraise our people in dollars and cents. It destroys the balance of the scales of the sanctuary. It has made many a priest cold and cruel. It has made others vulgar and abusive. It brings out the spirit which Judas expressed, *quid vultis mihi dare?* It destroys the religious atmosphere which should prevail in the House of God and turns the pulpit into an auction block.

Many a time good Catholics would like to bring a non-Catholic friend to church, but they refrain from inviting him because they fear the effect of one of the tirades to which they are frequently subjected.

Yes, the financial problem is vexing. We need money as we need air and food. No matter how learned and saintly a priest is, nothing can supply the place of money for building and maintaining. Most of our people have very little interest in the work of the parish. With all our urging, they give little and that little reluctantly. It is essential that they be shown their duty and persuaded to it.

No fixed rule can be given for attaining this end. It may be necessary to try many plans before *the* plan is discovered. But that plan is discoverable. Into it must enter the character of the priest as well as the character of the people. In it sincerity will hold a high place. Tell them the truth. If you make a promise, keep it. When you need money, tell them how much you need and why you need it. Try to fix upon a quota and give them time to pay it. The people appreciate considerate treatment. They will follow the pastor who shows them that he deserves their regard

and their support. But do not make the mistake of putting money before doctrine. The Lord sent us to teach, not to pass the basket.

MSGR. JOHN L. BELFORD

Brooklyn, N. Y.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September, 1898, the leading article is a paper on "The Course of Dogma in our Seminaries." The writer believes that the seminarians should have a modern text-book in preference to the *Summa* as a manual, but also that every student should have the *Summa* available, so that he may readily refer to it and familiarize himself with its main contents. He also suggests that there be regular academies wherein the seminarians can discuss books and articles pertinent to their studies. . . . Fr. P. De Roo, writing on "The Bible Among the Indians," describes certain beliefs that prevailed among the American aborigines, which are very similar to doctrines taught in the Sacred Scripture, such as the fall of man, the immortality of the soul, heaven and hell, and even the Holy Trinity. The writer believes that these tenets imply a knowledge, however remote, of biblical revelation. . . . An account of the foundation and early years of the Sisters of Loretto constitutes another article in the series on American religious communities. . . . Fr. N. Pfeil narrates the history of St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland, established in a very modest way in 1848 by one of the pioneers of the Church in America, Bishop Rappe. . . . Another instalment of Canon Sheehan's popular novel "My New Curate" appears in this issue. . . . In the *Analecta* we read an apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII to the bishops of Scotland, in which the Pope reminds them that the first act of his apostolic ministry, performed on the second day of his pontificate, was the restoration of the hierarchy to Scotland. . . . This issue also contains an instruction from Cardinal Satolli, prefect of the Congregation of Studies, giving directions to the bishops of Spain regarding the regulation of studies in the ten pontifical universities recently erected in that country. . . . A correspondent suggests that the confessionals in our churches be adorned with inscriptions, such as the symbol of the keys and the text: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them."

F. J. C.

MISSION THEOLOGY AND COMMON SENSE

The final paragraph in St. Matthew's Gospel—for all practical purposes, Christ's "Last Will and Testament"—is surely the main basis for the Catholic Church's missionary activity, down through the ages. For there the Son of God says explicitly: "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."[1] That commission, and the means whereby it was to be put into effect, had been explained to the Apostles time and time again. They were thus well prepared for its enunciation as Christ stood on the Mount of Olives, immediately before his Ascension.

In fact, Christ's call to the first two disciples—"Simon, who is called Peter, and his brother Andrew"—had been a preliminary announcement of their life work: "Come, follow me, and I will make you fishers of men."[2] In his various discourses with the twelve, Christ had ever kept before their minds the task of going out and converting the world. "You are the salt of the earth," He assured them . . . "the Light of the World." [3] "But be on your guard," He warned them, "For they will deliver you up to councils, and you will be beaten in synagogues, and you will stand before governors and kings for my sake, for a witness to them. And the gospel must first be preached to all the nations . . ."[4]

St. Luke tells us that it was while on the way out to the Mount of Olives, immediately before the Ascension, that Christ gave the eleven His final instructions, saying that "Remission and repentance of sins should be preached in His name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem."[5] In his *Acts of the Apostles,* the evangelist completes the narrative, recording that Christ assured them: "You shall be witnesses for me in Jerusalem and Samaria, and even to the very ends of the earth."[6]

These are the basic concepts and commands with which every true priest and zealous missionary fortifies himself in his travail to spread the Gospel, to convert the souls with whom he comes

[1] *Mt,* 28: 18-20.
[2] *Mt.* 4: 18.
[3] *Mt.* 5: 13, 14.
[4] *Mk.* 13: 9-11.
[5] *Lk.* 24: 47.
[6] *Acts* 1: 8.

into contact to the knowledge, love, and Church of Jesus Christ. They are likewise the immediate instructions that inspired the missionary activity so vividly described in that first real history of the missions, the *Acts of the Apostles.* Thus, for example, on the first Pentecost Sunday we find St. Peter addressing the "devout men from every nation under heaven," then assembled in Jerusalem, and telling them explicitly: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise and to your children, and to all who are far off, even to all whom the Lord our God calls."[7] "Now they received his word and were baptized, and there were added that day about three thousand souls."[8]

St. Paul, in turn, seems to have had little doubt about the exact nature and end of his stewardship, speaking as he so frequently does of "Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have received grace and apostleship, to bring about obedience to faith among all the nations for his name's sake."[9] Nor is he "ashamed of his Gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes, to Jew first, and then to Greek. . . ."[10]

The immediate tradition of the sub-Apostolic Fathers and their literature, from the *Didaché* and the *Letter to Barnabas,* to Justin, Polycarp, and Ignatius of Antioch, seems to leave no doubt in mind that their office was to spread the Gospel by converting all mankind to the faith of Jesus Christ—thus to enlarge the Kingdom of God.[11]

The great missionary effort thus put into motion by the Apostles went on without cease during the early centuries of the Church. Once the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries had taken time out to analyze and clarify the deposit of faith on the great Trinitarian and Christological dogmas, the missionary effort was pursued with renewed vigor by Frumentius, Patrick, Augustine of Canterbury and Boniface, Columbanus, Cyril and Methodius, etc., all down the centuries. It is St. Thomas who, amid the movements to solidify the faith at home, and carry it abroad in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, helps to sum up the wisdom

[7] *Acts* 2: 38-39.

[8] *Ibid.,* : 41.

[9] *Rom.* 1: 5.

[10] *Ibid.,* 16.

[11] *Didache,* 12-13; *Ep. Barnabae* 5, 9-10, Ignat. *Ep. ad Mag.* 9-11; Polycarp, *Ep. ad Phillip.* 7-12; Just., *Dial. cum Tryph.* 100-110.

of the scholastic age upon this, as upon so many other questions. He writes a whole magnificent treatise, the *Summa Contra Gentiles,* to enable his contemporaries to size up the theological issues involved in furthering the great apostolic spread of the faith.[12]

With the renewed impetus given to missionary activities in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, particularly under the prodding of the new geographical discoveries of the age, there came the need of stabilizing missionary efforts, and of redefining the aims, prerogatives and needs of this essential work of the Church. Pope Gregory XV set himself to this task, and on June 22, 1622 made a start by canonically erecting the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, through the issue of the Bull *Inscrutabili.*[13] The pontiff is most explicit as to the nature of his designs: "And who is there who does not know," he asks, "that our every solicitude desires, and every effort we make demands the work of leading souls to the Church of Christ?"[14]. . . . "Nor can we contemplate without tears how great a number of errant and dispersed sheep there are in these calamitous times, who either have never known the fold of Christ and His holy Church, or have been enticed away from it by the wiles of the devil." Hence the pope orders the organization of the Propaganda whose constituent members have full charge over all missionary labors for the spread of the Gospel.[15]

The popes of the last fifty years or so have likewise been most zealous and most explicit in their desires to have every soul brought into the true fold of Christ, no matter who or where that soul might be. In his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" Leo XIII says:

> It is sufficiently known to you that thus far no little part of our thought and care has been devoted to the attempt to recall the wandering souls to the fold, placed under the power of the chief pastor of souls, Jesus Christ. Since His divine office was to be perennial and perpetual, he added unto himself companions to share in his teaching, and made them participants of his power. When he had called down upon them the *Spirit of truth* from heaven, he commanded that they should proceed throughout the whole world; and that they should faith-

---

[12] Cf. J. Schmidlin, *Einführung in die Missionswissenschaft* (Münster, 1925) 52-95; St. Thom., *Sum Theol.* Ia-IIae, Q. 106, art. 4 ad 4.

[13] *Collectanea S.C.P.F.* I (1622-1866: Rome, 1907), 3.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Ibid.*

fully preach to all peoples whatever He had taught and prescribed; with this purpose in mind, that thereby through the profession of his doctrine and obedience to his laws, mankind might achieve holiness upon earth, and eternal happiness in heaven.[16]

World War I had hardly come to an end when Benedict XV gave a new impulse to missionary labors;[17] and the great "Pope of the Missions," Pius XI, was not slow to show his mind, also issuing an encyclical on the promotion of mission activity. In this we find the following statement.

> Our office indeed demands that out of love for God we must use our strength to increase not only the number of those who know and adore Him *"in the spirit and in truth,"* but that we must likewise bring under the rule of our most beloved Redeemer so many more, whereby the "utility in His blood" (Ps. 29, 10) may be seen to be more fruitful with the days, and that we may please Him the more, to whom indeed nothing can be more pleasing than that men should be saved, and come to an acknowledgment of truth.[18]

Thus there seems to be a definite tendency on the part of Scripture and Tradition, however briefly presented here, to indicate that the idea and ideal of the missionary work of the Church is immediately the salvation of souls, and their acquisition for the kingdom of Christ here on earth.

It is only within the last thirty years, however, that an attempt has been made by Catholic theologians and historians to set out a definite theory of the Church's mission work, designated variously as "Missiology," the "Science of the Missions," or "Mission Theology." The immediate impulse for this development was supplied by R. P. Robert Streit, O.M.I., and taken up with enthusiasm by the International Institute for Scientific Mission Studies at the German Catholic Congress of 1911.[19] Then in 1917, Dr. Joseph Schmidlin published the first edition of his *Introduction to the Science of the Mission.*[20] Since then, a great number of such

[16] *ASS* (1895-96), 708-709.

[17] *De fide catholica per orbem terrarum propaganda* (30 Nov. 1919).

[18] *Rerum Ecclesiae,* AAS, 1926, 65 f.

[19] Cf. Schmidlin, *Einführung* 24 ff.; A. Seumois, "Vers une définition de l'activité missionnaire" *Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire* 3 (1947) 162.

[20] J. Schmidlin, *Katholische Missionslehre im Grundriss* (Münster, 1917, 1925); cf. also his *Einführung,* cited above, n. 12. and his *Catholic Mission Theory* (transl. made at Techny, I11. 1931).

works have appeared, particularly in Europe, in which many newly elaborated theories about the ends, basic ideas, and motives for the mission work of the Catholic Church have been set forth. Needless to say, not all of these dissertations have served to clarify issues; nor have they all been of immediate assistance in pursuing the Church's monumental task.

After a brief enumeration of the basic foundations for the mission work of the Church, Dr. Schmidlin outlined his theory in which he maintains that the primary and immediate end of missionary activity is the conversion and baptism of non-Christians; and secondly the extension of the Christian religion, and the spread of the true Church of Christ. He thus explicitly excludes from his concept of missionary activity the apostolate among heretics, schismatics, and other types of baptized non-Catholics.[21] This idea was almost immediately accepted in Germany and Italy as the ruling concept for Catholic missionary work.

Then under the influence of Pierre Charles, S.J., a dissertation was produced in 1924 at the University of Louvain entitled, *Le Probléme Théologique des Missions,* by a young Jesuit, René Lange, wherein the author attacked with vehemence the idea that the primary end of Missionary activity is the salvation of individual souls. His contention was that the Catholicity of the Church—the requirement of its very nature to be universal, independently of the salvation of souls—is the basic motive behind Catholic mission work. The author insisted that salvation is possible outside the visible Church; and that the difficulties of so being saved have been exaggerated.[22]

Returning to a thesis he had elaborated as far back as 1913, R. P. Th. Gentrup, S.V.D., published his *Jus Missionarium* in 1925, stating unequivocally that Missionary activity is "that part of the Church's ministry which maintains the implanting and consolidation of the Catholic Faith among non-Catholics." For him, then, the principal end of the missions is spreading the seed of the Gospel among individuals outside the visible Church, with the immediate intent of building among them a segment of the true Church with its hierarchy, and thus making the means of salvation

[21] Schmidlin, *Kath. Missionsl.* 29-39, 201-203.

[22] R. Lange, *Le Problème Théologique des Missions.* Coll. Xaveriana 3 (Louvain, 1924); cf. J. Masson, *Nouv. Rev. Théol.* 64 (1937) 1129.

at least morally accessible to all. For him, a territory would juridically cease to be considered a missionary land when its people form and administer a part of the Catholic Church, depending on themselves alone for their subsistence.[23]

In 1926, the encyclical *Rerum Ecclesiae* made its appearance. For all practical purposes it canonized the idea that missionary activity concerned all peoples and all the countries of the world, and was not limited to pagan lands.[24] In the wake of the encyclical, Père Charles, S.J., returned to his contention that the "real *raison d'être* (of the Missions) is to be found in the fact that the missions have as their proper object the establishment of the visible Church; that which motivates them is the very nature of the Church to be identified with the geographic dimensions of humanity." "It is not theologically correct," he wrote, "to say that the Church is merely a means to save souls. . . . It is much more than a means of saving souls; it is the divine form of the world, the sole point of encounter wherein the whole of creation makes its return to the Redeemer. . . ." [25]

Under the impulse of a congress of the Missionary Union of the Clergy in France in 1932, Abbé Glorieux came forward with the thesis that, while the necessity for mission activity and the salvation of souls are really two correlative terms, the real basis for missionary apostolate lies not so much in the question of life and death, through grace, for pagans, but in a question of the "plentitude of sanctifying life." [26] R. P. Henri de Lubac, S.J., elaborated upon this idea in his thesis concerning a "collective salvation." He held that whereas each man, individually taken, can achieve salvation, the mass of mankind, taken collectively will not obtain salvation, outside the Church. It is thus that the Church is necessary for salvation, with a necessity of means, that mankind as a whole may come to the kingdom of God.[27]

Then a number of writers, enthusiasts, and theologians jumped

[23] Th. Gentrup, *Jus Missionarium* (Style, 1925) 1-8.

[24] AAS 18 (1926) 74.

[25] P. Charles, *Les Dossiers del'Action Missionnaire* (2 ed. Louvain, 1939): "La Raison d'être des Missions" No. 37. Cf. his *Missiologie: Etudes, Rapports, Conférences* (Louvain 1939), 84-87.

[26] Glorieux, "Nécessité des Missions ex parte infidelium" *Suppl. Revue de l'Un. Miss. Cler.* (Oct., 1933) 19-35.

[27] H. de Lubac, "Nécessité des Missions" *ibid.* 37-54.

into the fray, including Fr. Hugueny, O.P., who introduced the vexing question of the number of souls who will actually be saved;[28] Mr. Joseph Peters and Fr. Freitag, who reverted to a dogmatic position elucidated by Fr. W. Stockums in 1933;[29] and once more Père de Lubac and l'Abbé Glorieux.[30] The former, while admitting that the real motive for the establishment of missionary work had been given by Christ in his commission instituting the Church, still felt that the fundamental virtue justifying the spread of the faith is charity, with which he seems to identify the Church itself.[31]

In 1942, R. P. Alexander Durand, S.J., affirmed that while the Missions are the ordinary and normal means of salvation for souls, they are not an indispensable means; and that the success of the Redemptive work of Christ could be fulfilled without them. Missions for the salvation of the souls of infidels are actually a luxury, a normal, and no doubt necessary luxury, but just the same a work of super-erogation which in no way really changes the economy of salvation.[32]

Canon Glorieux returned to the charge in 1944, placing special emphasis on the fact that although the primary end of the missions was to assure the expansion of the more abundant life of grace, they are an absolute necessity for the salvation of the soul of the non-Catholic.[33] In an attempt to steer a middle path through the theories thus far elucidated, Fr. Capéran, in October 1945, pointed to the fact that the extraordinary means of salvation for those not belonging to the visible Church are but a provisory supplement in the economy of salvation, which definitely looks to the spread of the faith, and the achievement of grace for salvation,

[28] Hugueny, "Le scandale édifiant d'une exposition missionnaire" *Rev. Thom.* 38 (1933) 217-242; 533-567.

[29] J. Peters, "Ein Program zur theol. Begrüngung der Mission" (1940) 1-5; A. Freitag, "Die Errichtung des Bottesreiches als leitende Missionsidee" *ibid.* (1940) 97-109; W. Stockums, "Die dogm. Grundl. der kirchl. Mission," *Priester und Mission,* (1933) 7-14.

[30] H. de Lubac, *Le fondement thélogique des Missions* (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1941) 32 pp.; Glorieux, *Pourquoi tous les catholiques doivent être missionnaires?"* (Lille, 1944) 24 pp.

[31] Lubac, *ibid.* 21-24.

[32] A. Durand, *Le problème théologique des Missions* (Le Puy, 1942) 30 pp.

[33] P. Glorieux, "Pourquoi tous les catholiques doivent être missionnaires" (Lille, 1944, ed. de S.A.M.) 24 pp.

through missionary work.[34] Finally, in an extremely well worked-out theological tract, wherein he pauses to enumerate the work and ideas thus far elaborated, Fr. A. Seaumois, O.M.I. has attempted by means of the classical four-causes approach to pin down a definition of missionary activity that will at once be theologically correct and in close co-relation with the work now being accomplished. He concludes:

> Missionary activity is that part of the church's ministry which is concerned with the apostolate of implanting the Catholic Church in those lands where it is not as yet stably constituted. Its end is ordained to the work of the conversion of souls and their normally achieving justification. This is an activity which is justified by both divine and ecclesiastical law, as well as by the very nature of the church itself, whose prerogative to be spatially universal is founded upon the universality of mankind and the universality of the redemption ordained for man.[35]

To this observer, it seems that the theologians would much better turn their attention to devising ways and means of increasing the missionaries' effectiveness by supplying them with well worked out points of theology and apologetics that will fit modern needs and conditions in putting the Gospel of Christ across to the modern heathen, whether he's to be met with in the Gobi desert, the Campos of Brazil, or on the streets of Milan, Paris or New York. They might likewise work out a clearer approach to the prayer and the special graces that must accompany missionary activity if it is to be crowned with God's "giving the increase."[36]

That, of course, much good work is actually being done along these practical, theological lines is evident from even a mere casual acquaintance with the seminary and university curricula, and the contents of some of the better missionary periodicals.[37] But that

[34] L. Capéran, "La mission de l'Eglise et les Missions," *Rev. de L'U.M.C. de France* (1945) 172-179; (1946) 21-28; 65-72.

[35] A. Seumois, "Vers une définition de l'Activité Missionnaire" *Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire* 3 (1947) 161-178; 254-261; 4 (1948) 1-16, an excellent resume of all this material.

[36] See for example: M. Olphe-Galliard, "Spiritualité missionnaire et mystère de la croix," *Rev. d'Ascétique et Mystique* 23 (1947) 201-221.

[37] Cf. for example J. Specker, "Dissertationem der missionswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Propaganda" *Nouv. Rev.d. sci. miss.* 3 (1947) 304-306, and the various lists of missionary periodicals in the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi, De Katholieke Missien, Le Missioni Cattoliche,* etc.

there is also great danger of too much theorizing and "academic theologising" is evident from the works cited in the course of this exposé, which are really only a sampling of a vast literature; and also from the cautions issued by Father Albert Perbal in his excellent little treatise, *Ritorno alle Fonti*.[38]

For the matter of the purpose, the ends, and the motives behind missionary activity, the Church itself has been most careful not to make any polarizing or paralyzing decision. The Code of Canon Law is apparently purposely vague and non-committal on the matter, failing even to distinguish precisely between home and foreign mission work.[39] It gives the impression, quite in accord with actual fact, that missionary activity, no matter where or how entered upon, is a means of winning souls to the knowledge and love of God in the Catholic Church. Hence particular methods, places and spheres of activity are mere matters of policy and convenience—for the Church to decide as befits her needs and resources. Such policy need not and should not be canonized into hard and irreducible rules or systems. Like the sacraments, the missions are for the souls of men; and the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda is flexible enough in its organization and operation to fit itself into any situation, no matter how well or ill the nation or territory may be organized.[40]

In his Encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis,* Pius XII leaves little doubt as to both the necessity and the scope of missionary activity. He declares:

> Nor is it to be thought that Christ the Head although placed in so sublime a position, has no need of the body. For even of this mystical body must be said what St. Paul affirmed of the human body: "the head cannot say to the feet: 'you are not necessary for me' " . . . However a matter for wonderment it may seem, Christ still has need of his members . . . and he desires to be aided by the members of his body in prosecuting the work of Redemption. . . .[41]

Likewise, from the very beginning of our pontificate, nothing has been more in our heart than those who do not belong to the visible

---

[38] A. Perbal, *Ritorno Alle Fonti* (Rome, 1942), see esp. pp. 102-104.

[39] Canons 1349, 1350 and 1351.

[40] Cf. canon 252; Paventi, "Concetto di Missione e del Diritto Missionario," *Pensiero Missionario* (1941), 37-41; A. Seamois, "Vers un definition. . ." *Nouv. Rev. d. sci. miss.* 3 (1947), 176-178.

[41] AAS, 1943, 212-213.

body of the Catholic Church . . . that they may have life, and have it more abundantly. Hence we desire to re-iterate in this Encyclical Letter . . . inviting each and all with a most loving heart, that they should endeavor by means of the internal impulses of divine grace freely and sufficiently being given them, to free themselves from that state in which they are not able to be sure of their own eternal welfare; and even though by an unrecognized desire and wish, they are now ordained toward the mystical body of the Redeemer, still they lack ever so many and such great heavenly aids which can be enjoyed in the Catholic Church alone.[42]

Today, of course, the Church faces so many difficulties and problems on what used to be considered the "home front" in re-introducing the Gospel and the teaching of Christ to modern man in modern centers of salvation, that two zealous French priests have been tempted to ask: *"France, pays de mission?"* [43] The doctrinaire theologian throws up his hands in horror at the very notion. Yet there is many a serious minded priest in some corner of Europe, or America, or Asia, who feels that our big cities, and our far-flung well-populated country districts are almost every bit as much in need of good solid missionary effort as are China, the Islands of the Far East and Japan. It is an open secret that the Maryknoll Missionaries, switching from their Asiatic mission grounds to the priest-lacking areas of South America, because of the recent war, found the work of reclaiming these poor neglected peoples in many ways more difficult than the conversion of the out-and-out non-Christian.[44]

The distinction between pagan and Christian, between heathen and believer, when applied to those outside the visible Church of Christ, at least as far as missionary effort is concerned, has always tended to cause difficulty, even embarrassment.[45] Today such concepts as "pagan lands" and "Christian lands" are losing their semantic validity. Even in the matter of an established hierarchy

[42] *Ibid.* 242-243.

[43] H. Godin et Y. Daniel, *La France pays de Mission?* (Lyon et Paris, 1943); cf. also Michonneau, *La Paroisee, communauté missionnaire* (Paris, 1946); and Boulard, *Problemes missionnaires de la France rurale* (Paris, 1946).

[44] Cf. editorial comment in *America* 78 (1948) 675-676; and J. J. Considine, *Call for 40,000* (New York, 1946).

[45] Cf. A. Seamois, *art. cit.* 172-173.

as a specific differentiating characteristic, there are plenty of areas where, despite the fact that there exists a well founded, self-supporting episcopate, there simply never have been enough priests. The result is that special groups of people, for some reason or other, have never been evangelized—as for example, vast numbers of the negroes both in the southern and in northern sections of the U. S.[46] In like manner many areas of Europe that were once integral parts of Catholic Christendom, now lack all but a Bishop and a few priests. Are these not to be considered mission territories?

In a sermon for the Feast of St. Martin, quoted in the breviary for April 27, St. Peter Canisius, no mean "home missionary" himself, teaches:

> It is not sufficient for the evangelical doctor to enlighten the people with the word; to stand forth as a voice crying in the wilderness; and to lend tongue to fostering piety among many. . . . But it behooves him to be afire, that imbued with charity and zeal, he may adorn his apostolic office, and follow where St. Paul leads. The latter was not content to command the bishop of the Ephesians: "Order this and teach that; labor as a good soldier of Christ." But he himself was constantly evangelizing among both friend and foe. He could say to the bishops gathered at Ephesus with good conscience: "You know how we have let pass nothing that would be of use in making known to you, and in teaching in public as well as in your houses, giving testimoney to both Jews and gentiles of penitence in God, and of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." Such should be the pastor in the Church, who after the fashion of St. Paul becomes all things to all, that in him, the infirm may find a cure, the sorrowful joy. . . .

Today, a much more realistic approach to our problem as the successors of the Apostles, would be to consider all the world a missionary field; and to apply, on the home front, as well as in far off lands, our "mission theology" to the every day work of converting the unknowing "Catholic" as well as "heathen."

Rome, Italy. FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

[46] Cf. G. Monticone, "L'Organizzazione missionaria della Chiesa," *Guida delle Missioni Cattoliche* (Rome, 1935) 30-54.

MISSION INTENTION

"The Defence of the Catholic Schools in India" is the Mission Intention for the month of September, 1948.

THE INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL CAUSES OF UNBELIEF

There is one point in which all men resemble each other; it is that they are all different. Underneath the many diversities of individual life may be discerned the features of a spirit of the times. Generations differ almost as much as the men who compose them. There is, so to speak, a personal equation in every age. The present one is no exception, although the individual features ascribed to it will depend on the point of view taken. Thus from the medical side it might be called an age of hysteria, from the political side an age of democracy, and so on. But looking at it in its religious aspect, there is no doubt that it stands confessed as an age of unbelief.

The profund and widespread disturbance of soul in regard to the fundamental truths of religion, in its popular manifestations, takes the form of uncertainty rather than of denial, of unbelief rather than of disbelief. This latter distinction is of much importance. Unbelief suggests a mere withholding of belief; disbelief implies a positive rejection of what is stated. The definition would imply that disbelief is based on the rejection of a proposition because of the lack of credibility in the evidence offered in its support, while unbelief can be maintained in the face of evidence objectively overwhelming. In other words, the causes of unbelief can be found to a great extent within the person himself.

Before beginning an examination of these causes, certain fundamental notions concerning the human person himself must be established. This is necessary because of the materialistic tendency to superevaluate man, with a consequent repudiation of the dogma of Original Sin; because of the agnostic attitude that belief and unbelief are mere intellectual processes which cannot have any conceivable influence over conduct, nor affect in any way one's power for good; and finally because of the errors of rationalism, which lie either in a dependence upon mere intellectuality divorced from rightly ordered affections and the will, or in the endeavor to employ reason in perverse ways that reduce or destroy its value for the appropriation of divine truth. The modern tendency, following Kant, Hegel, and Schleiermacher, is to isolate the intellectual and volitional processes as much as possible, to deny any interplay or interdependence of the two, and thus to

make is more difficult for man to assent to the truths of religion. Not to realize the falsity of this aberration is to fail in any attempt to establish both the intellectual and moral causes of unbelief. It is to deny the true nature of the very faculties which these causes affect, and to fail to realize wherein they can be deflected in their search for truth.

In the face of such confusion of thought concerning the relationship of man's noblest faculties, it is necessary to assert the indivisible unity of the human person. Man is equipped with distinct faculties of feeling, willing and knowing, but these are not separate organs, nor is a divorce between them possible. St. Thomas repeats frequently that it is not the intellect that sees, but man through the intellect, nor the will that wills, but man through the will. The soul acts always in accordance with its nature, as an inseparable unit. Its fundamental faculties must act together, the operation of each implying and involving the operation of the rest. It is as impossible to suppress one of them as it is to cause an ordinary flame to give light without yielding heat, or furnish heat without shedding light. Not the ingenious exercise of a single faculty, but the employment of the whole man is required in any attempt to reach the truth. Thus it can be said that the personal and moral equation determines the success of any attempt at truth-seeking, and truth-seeking is the primary end of all human reason. The human thinker remains a moral and spiritual agent when he thinks, and is always obliged to reason in the manner of such an agent.

The implications of this stand with regard to the intellectual and moral causes of unbelief are at once evident. If man is an indivisible unit, possessed of separate yet not isolated faculties of knowing and willing; if within the sphere of his being there is a constant interplay of these two faculties with their accompanying influence on each other, so that one cannot be said to act without the other, then it can be seen how any attempt to account for unbelief must of necessity follow lines of exposition suggested by such a view. It will discount as a cause of unbelief the arguments which can be advanced against a theory in the abstract, and will focus attention on the motives by which in practice individuals are prevented from accepting it. However convincing may be the evidence which exists in support of unbelief, actually it may be maintained through

the influence of motives which are, from the standpoint of reason, insufficient. These motives are of two types, intellectual and moral.

Inasmuch as truth is the object of the intellect and goodness or duty the object of the will, it can be said simply that the intellectual and moral causes of unbelief are those which impede these two faculties in attaining the knowledge and granting the assent necessary for religious belief. The two types of causes need not necessarily be present at the same time or, if they are, with the same degree of intensity. Thus, for example, an object may be recognized as a truth long before it is recognized as a duty, owing to the pressure on the will of manifold moral influences. Some souls are intellectually convinced of the truth of the faith, long before they have faith in the truth. Nor must it be thought that all such causes may be summarily classified as "intellectual" or "moral," and assumed that they can be kept so divided. It means only that their primary influence will be exerted on a particular faculty, not however to the exclusion of the other. While these intellectual and moral causes are exerting their pull, the unified person of man, insofar as it is possible, becomes a divided self.

"Divide and conquer" becomes the order of the day, and a disorderly mob of powers, forces, desires and activities assault the particular faculty most vulnerable to them, and lay seige. The inclination to believe, as natural to man as the thirst for knowledge or the craving for love, in its primal stirrings is attacked by forces whose existence was never before suspected. Yet it must be remembered that these causes, so far as they have their source in evil, flow from faults of which everyone partakes; pride of intellect, haste of judgment, the preference of the seen to the unseen, the impatience of ignorance, the vain demand of perfection in the finite comprehension of the infinite, and the disloyalty of the reason to conscience. Why their presence should be so particularly felt in the question of belief leads to a discussion of the primary moral influence affecting man's assent to the truths of religion.

This first influence or cause arises from the very nature of religious belief itself. It is not necessary to examine the essence of such belief to establish the fact that it calls for far deeper inquiry into the subject of assent than belief in other spheres. This is due not to any quality inherent in religious faith as such, but

merely to its more profound effect on man's life, and to the fact that it exacts definite formal profession of acceptance. Generally speaking, man is not too much concerned about investigating truths which do not influence his personal conduct. Thus the scientist can coldly investigate a problem of science because it has no intimate connection with his own life. In matters involving religious belief, however, certain unwelcome aspects present themselves, involving an accompanying moral pressure. The truths of religion bring with them a distasteful conviction of sin and also certain serious duties and responsibilities. The natural man shrinks more or less from the exercise of a faith which entails self-sacrifice, and there occurs a moral struggle which tends to obscure the strict rationality of the process required for the mastery of divine truth. This pressure which arises from the object of religious assent is not due so much to a lack of light or any motive of the intellectual order as to moral causes—such as necessary separations, the unknown and uncertain future, a thousand seeming phantoms which storm the soul. To the believer they seem trite and unimportant, but their influence is far reaching. To ignore such considerations in determining the moral causes for unbelief is tantamount to building a house without having first laid a foundation.

Having treated of the influence which is exerted by the object of religious belief itself, it is now necessary to consider how the human character, inlaid with its own fundamental convictions, can be a contributory moral cause of unbelief.

The personal religious appreciation of an individual is largely fashioned by forces which have their source in the deeper functions of his nature. It has been well said that man's most important beliefs revolve about his conception of human character. Such a standard can well become the test by which questions of deep significance, including that of religious belief, are judged. If what appears to a man is a type of mind, clever but sceptical, critical and sarcastic, the character which makes its aim to seek out and destroy what it takes to be false, rather than to build up what it takes to be good, then he will tend to regulate his beliefs according to his model. He will be readier to see differences than to see proofs, to distrust than to trust, to condemn hastily than to sympathize and understand. Such a man is ill-fitted to assent to religious truths,

and while such a description cannot be said to be generally characteristic of the modern mind, it is definitely a type common among unbelievers. A false sense of values, finding expression in the character of the individual, explains how the virus of unbelief can take hold of his soul. If it is true that to recognize the truth of a religion from its fruits, the standard must be that of our own moral feeling and convictions, it is also true that those moral feelings and convictions must be founded on objective fundamental principles. But such is not the case with the unbeliever. A discussion of the influence of these principles on the intellect, the part played by prejudice in forming them, the intellectual pride involved in maintaining them, and finally a consideration of how the will under the promptings of moral forces plays the principal role in producing unbelief, will round out this treatment.

It has been said previously that the character of man serves as the source of his most fundamental convictions, which in turn are employed as the standard for judging any question. Thus, their importance as causes of unbelief is paramount. Time and time again it happens that a man will inquire into religion without any distinct idea of what religion is, and consequently with very indefinite and vague, not to say wholly erroneous principles guiding his investigation. His faintly glimmering notion that religion is something divine, and intended for the spiritual benefit and eternal happiness of mankind, is made even more wavering by suspicion that it is little more than a theory, a speculation, a gush of feeling accompanied by a persuasion that past sins are forgiven and that the sinner is now reconciled to God. Objective first principles are lost sight of in some favorite preconceived theory. Of the many who start out on the journey of ratiocination, very few arrive. The majority shy off at some point in the argument and will not, or cannot, continue; the failure of the intellect to believe lies in some fallacious first principle which has been accepted as beyond question, and whose validity has not been tested. Newman attributed the unbelief of his day to faulty first principles, and the same can be said of the present age. If a man's premises are wrong, then even though he reasons logically, his conclusion must be false. Thus is explained the intellectual suicide of a man who, rejecting the sane objectivity of Christianity, leaps off the uppermost peaks of thought into an absurdity beside which the wildest dreams of a pseudo-mystic

are perfectly rational. Just as a man born blind may be told again and again of distinctions of color or of the nearness of objects, and may nevertheless remain persuaded that his own wrong notions are true; so a man may have at his fingertips all the arguments for the existence of God or for the Christian religion and remain unconvinced, because perverted first principles becloud any appeal they may have to his intellect.

But, it may be argued, what about conscience? In matters of less consequence to man, faulty first principles may indeed impede the intellect in its search for truth, but in the question of religious belief that is not true. Beneath the depths of human personality may be found traces of the God who has not left Himself without a witness. Conscience is a personal guide, and despite the influence of mistaken religious assent on the individual, despite his imperfect religious appreciation, despite false first principles, if he follows his conscience he will be led out of the darkness of unbelief. This is the ideal picture but its realization is another matter. The inexorable working of multiple influences both within and without the individual, to which the general title of "prejudices" is given, accounts for the fixation of character in one direction, for the rooting of first principles, and for the deadening of the voice of conscience.

The consideration of those things which exist objectively outside man as opposed to concepts of the mind, must always in some degree reflect the personality of the individual. He tends to group about them a cluster of associations and ideas, the outcome of past judgments. All these compose man's knowledge of the thing. So too with religion; his knowledge and attitude towards it will be colored largely by his prejudices, which if unchecked, will divert the intellect, through the will, from the road which leads to belief. No man whose mind is fettered by preconceived opinions can expect to attain to a knowledge of the truth without first breaking his bonds. A man who is wedded to a favorite theory and who is resolved not to give it up, whether it be right or wrong, cannot expect to have sufficient courage to embrace a truth which conflicts with that theory. A false conclusion acts as a prejudice. A point of view, when acted upon for years, seems like an intuition. The fact of having to discredit what was formerly held as true leads one to discredit his intellectual faculties for holding it true. It happens that a person may become deeply attached to

a state of unbelief, and when a stimulus to belief is offered, the unbeliever, as a result of custom, inclination or prejudice, is determined, no matter what the cost, to maintain his position. This can be true only because the mind from the first dawning of consciousness begins to receive impressions from without, which, whether as tendencies only or actual beliefs, determine the character and flow of its current. The human mind then, from the very condition and circumstances of its growth, is subject to prejudice. This tendency is accentuated by the power over reason of the non-rational side of man's nature; pride it may be or laziness, or instability, or lack of appreciation. The very instrument, the mind itself, varies in every case, and may be powerful and acute, or dull and stupid. If the mind, by virtue of the condition of its growth, is fixed in a groove wholly alien to the dispositions of humility and honesty needed for belief, then is the task of coming to belief almost impossible.

Thus it can be seen how intimately connected with the complex workings of those forces which militate against belief is pride of intellect. Like a mother it carefully fosters these other causes to make it more difficult for the mind to embrace any truth which is not in harmony with a particularly cherished habit of thought. A relentless struggle against the moral elements required in faith is its constant occupation. It stifles the intellect's desire for truth; it scoffs at docility in the presence of competent learning and authority, it belittles honesty in doing justice to every pertinent fact and argument. Such pride is one of the great obstacles to the entrance of God's grace into the soul. "God rejects the proud and gives His grace to the humble." Those who embrace it must take this as one of their fundamental convictions.

One last word about the will. When, turned away from the pursuit of good by the various causes of unbelief which have been mentioned, the will fails in its duty to the intellect, then is it impossible, without an extraordinary grace from God, to attain to the truth of religious belief. Unbelief will ever remain the state of the soul whose faculties do not work in unhampered correlation. The will must keep prejudice and all other moral influences inexorably in check lest the intellect fail to follow the lead of the argument. Here especially is seen the dependence and interplay of these two faculties, and also how difficult it is to classify a cause of unbelief, such as

prejudice, either as an intellectual or moral one. If the will is set in a particular direction, the mind becomes incapable of judging impartially. It can only appreciate evidence which supports the desired theory. That the will can affect thought so as to blind the mind to the true situation cannot be denied. Thus the reason why men maintain their state of unbelief so tenaciously is to be sought in the will rather than the intellect. The motive that attracts the will to faith may present itself under different forms—under the form of an obligation, or under the form of an affectionate attraction or craving of the heart. It requires a contrary motive of the moral order to quench this attraction of the will to what is good, and thus stifle also the further pursuit by the intellect of the truth it has first apprehended. In the degree that intellectual honesty and integrity of will are impaired, the difficulties of overcoming unbelief increase.

By such causes as have been here set forth, unbelief is produced and fostered in the soul of man. To understand their influence is to realize what difficulties must be overcome in leading people so affected to the truth. In the light of the subtle workings of these causes, the seeming paradox of a man who turns scornfully from embracing religious belief to loving some human being or following some idea with such intensity that it becomes a religion, is more comprehensible. That he makes a master out of a servant, light out of a shadow, is not due so much to the fact that he believes in them as that he must believe something easier to embrace than religious truths.

JOHN GREGORY CLANCY

Casa San Giovanni,
Vatican City

PAST AND FUTURE IN THE CHURCH

In the Catholic Church nothing can be said to have a future, save in so far as it has a past and is deeply rooted in tradition.

—Father Gerald Ellard, S.J., in *The Mass of the Future* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948), p. xi.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON THE PSALMS

PART II

The *Liber Psalmorum cum canticis breviarii Romani* was reviewed in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (CXIII, 1 [July, 1945], 16-26), thanks to Msgr. Stedman's generous initiative, before the printed work was available in this country. The review was necessarily brief and incomplete in many respects; for lack of time, the new translation could not be studied as fully as it deserved. Since that time many other articles have appeared, some criticizing the one or the other feature of the version, the great majority, however, welcoming the work. But *Le nouveau psautier latin,* the recent (1947) study of Fr. Bea, S.J., who speaks as one having authority on account of his association with the transaltion committee, deserves naturally very special attention. Fr. Bea had given a public lecture on the new text in the Gregoriana on April 25, 1945. This lecture was afterwards printed in *Biblica* (XXVI [1945], 203-237) and published separately. The *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (VIII [1946], 1-35) published an excellent English translation by A. Wand, so that Fr. Bea's ideas have become easily accessible to the English-speaking public. One might therefore be tempted simply to refer the reader desirous of acquainting himself with Fr. Bea's explanations to the translation in CBQ. But the *Nouveau psautier* is much more than a French translation of the original Italian lecture. It is an enlarged and improved text, a volume of 210 pages, which may be regarded as a new work, even if it does not contain anything essentially new or different from the first edition. In any case, it will be interesting and instructive to look into the Psalter under the competent guidance of a scholar like Fr. Bea, so closely connected with the work of translation.

The plan of the book, which is an excellent introduction to the new Latin text, is very simple and logical. A first part (pp. 13-14) acquaints the reader with the historical background, the antecedents, of the new translation: it outlines briefly the history of the ancient Latin version and of the revisions or independent translations of the Psalter down to recent times. The second part (pp. 37-65) examines the problem of the principles which were followed in the production of the new version. The third part (pp.

67-182) deals with the character and the spirit of the new Psalter: attitude towards the Hebrew text, the Latinity of the new version and related questions of form. The book concludes (pp. 185 ff.) with a brief account of the reception given to the new translation. This includes several representative quotations from appreciations of the new Psalter (pp. 188 ff.), and, besides a Bibliography (pp. 201-204), an index of the texts from the psalms and canticles discussed in the body of the book (pp. 205-208).

The origin of the Vulgate text of the psalms explains its unsatisfactory character as a version: the reader was in fact unable to understand it fully as a work making really sense in every part, in its own right. The Vulgate text, the so-called *Psalterium gallicanum,* is only a revision made by St. Jerome in 386 or 387, from the Septuagint, of an old Latin version translated itself very literally from the Greek. Its Latin is the popular Latin of the time, the *sermo vulgaris,* rather different in vocabulary and syntax from the classical Latin language. St. Jerome, responsible for that revision, could do much better, as we know from the text of his other translations found in the Vulgate, in particular from his version of the psalms made directly from the Hebrew, between 389 and 392—the *psalterium juxta Hebraeos.* But he did not feel free to make substantial changes in his revision of the psalms, so that that imperfect text, the *Gallicanum,* remained in our Latin Bible essentially as a witness of the old Latin Bible together with the other books not revised or translated by him, Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Machabees. Important or helpful as the *Gallicanum* may be for the textual critic, as a version it left much to be desired. Hence, since the sixteenth century, when recourse to Hebrew became more common among Christian scholars, many new Latin translations were made from the Hebrew text by Catholics and Protestants, though none gained sufficient prestige to impose itself upon the public. In Catholic circles, on behalf of those bound to recite the psalms in the Breviary, the wish was often expressed to have a new translation or a satisfactory revision of the psalms undertaken by the competent authorities. The wish was expressed quite frequently in the first part of this century.

But the practical execution of the project presented some serious difficulties. There was no real agreement on the kind of revision that should be made. The desire to maintain the liturgical continuity between the past and the present led several to propose waiting

for the psalms in the new edition of the Vulgate on which the Benedictine committee is engaged. This, however, appeared very unsatisfactory to those who realized the true nature of the work done by the Benedictine revisers, for their task is limited to a critical restoration of St. Jerome's genuine text. Apart from minor differences, the text resulting from the labors of the Benedictine commission could be expected to remain substantially identical with our present *Gallicanum,* thus without real improvement making its understanding easier. Another suggestion was simply to make a revision of the Vulgate—the *Gallicanum*—on the basis of the Septuagint, and to take the Hebrew into account chiefly in places where errors should be removed, thus in fact to do again and better what St. Jerome had tried to do on a more limited scale in 386-87. Such a procedure, however, would have resulted in a kind of patchwork, something like a book of the Douay-Rheims Version after corrections made in class by a professor of Scripture to better the text in difficult places, while leaving many other faulty passages unchanged, because otherwise too many modifications would become necessary. Another halfway solution proposed by some scholars was to adopt the *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos.* This version is unquestionably much superior to the *Gallicanum* and thus would bring the reader much closer to the sense of the original. Yet it cannot be denied that St. Jerome's own translation is imperfect: it is based on the traditional Hebrew text—the Masoretic text—in all essentials, just like the other Old Testament books translated by him. This, then, would leave us rather far from a critical version such as we understand the term now. It may be remarked also that the liturgical continuity would not have been saved by adopting the *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos,* since this text has very little in common with the *Gallicanum.*

The only course left, therefore, was to undertake a new version directly from the Hebrew. It was evident that the Hebrew could not be purely and simply the Masoretic text which underlies for instance the Authorized Version or the Revised Version of 1881 ff., or the more recent Jewish Translation of the Holy Scriptures published by a group of scholars who deliberately restricted themselves to the Masoretic text.[1] Though this Hebrew text preserves the original with substantial fidelity, it is well known to scholars

[1] This work was edited by the Jewish Publication Society of America (Philadelphia, 1917).

that we cannot appeal to the *Hebraica veritas* in the same way as St. Jerome and many others after him insufficiently acquainted with the history of the text and the problems of textual criticism. The Hebrew, as we know now, needs more or less extensive corrections. To the restoration of the text of the original authors which alone is the inspired text in the full sense of the word, the ancient versions made from the Hebrew and representing at times an older and better text, should contribute a most important and valuable help. The history of ancient writing, the better knowledge of Hebrew grammar and lexicography based on comparison with the ancient semitic languages, a better acquaintance with the history and the literatures of the ancient Near East, and archaeological discoveries, all place in the hands of the modern student resources unknown to earlier scholars and help in many places to correct the text or to understand it more perfectly. Even if we are not in a position to solve all the riddles, it is at least possible to do better work than was possible formerly. It was therefore a wise decision for those entrusted with the task of translating the psalms, and for the Holy See which declared itself unambiguously in favor of the measure, to undertake a critical version, one that would be based uncompromisingly on the accepted principles of textual criticism. If one could still entertain doubts regarding the wisdom of such a course or harbor suspicions on account of the possible consequences from the application of critical principles, they were quieted or silenced by the open endorsement of textual criticism by the Holy Father in the Encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* (Sept. 30, 1943).

Thus it is that the new translation of the psalms is a critical work, which, it may be noted in passing, makes good and wise use of the abundant textual material collected by the Danish Semitic scholar Frants Buhl, in Kittel-Kahle's *Biblia Hebraica* (1937). It makes use also of the resources furnished by modern progress in the knowledge of the Semitic languages,[2] and also of conjecture

[2] For instance, in *Ps. 16 (17)* 4b, the Vulgate's "custodivi vias *duras*" becomes "vias *legis*," by supposing a root preserved in Akkadian and Arabic. For other examples of the same nature—from the Psalter—cf. Bea, pp. 113 ff. The same method applied to *Ps. 108 (109)*, 24b, and *Ps. 136 (137)*, 5b, would allow us to find in both places the verb *SKH*, which, in the Hebrew Bible, means ordinarily "to forget," and to understand the verb from the Ugaritic *TKH*: to be (come) withered, to waste away (cf. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 84, 15).

more difficult to handle and liable to excesses (cf. *CBQ,* VII [1945], 72 ff.), but nevertheless capable of being used wisely as done by the Roman translators in several places (cf. examples: Bea, pp. 77 ff.; also in *Liber Psalmorum:* 2, 11-12; 4, 7; etc.). In the *Liber Psalmorum,* therefore, as the reader can easily ascertain by consulting the original edition[3] we find a critical rendering which marks a decided improvement. The psalms now make sense, even if in places the Roman editors note that the translation is somewhat doubtful; and, at least, the reader is no longer puzzled by the abrupt and irrational changes of tenses or moods in the verbs, which disfigured the old text in so many passages and contributed not a little to the obscurity of the sense in the *Gallicanum* (cf. Bea, pp. 104 ff). Even readers familiar with Hebrew, who, in the recitation of the office, tried to bear in mind the rules governing the usage of the Septuagint and therefore of the old Latin version, might not always recall the correction to be made in a particular passage (cf. Bea, p. 30).

The result also is a text stripped of the mysterious obscurities which, strangely enough, appeal to some (cf. Bea, pp. 101 f., 116, 120, 140, 151). Preachers and spiritual writers lose several favorite texts which have rightly disappeared as plain errors, the loss of which will rejoice those looking for the genuine thought of the original author (cf. Bea, pp. 99 ff.).

All these advantages from the point of view of the sense speak clearly in favor of the decision of having a new translation made from a critically restored Hebrew text, and no one can reasonably regret the decision. Another problem however confronted the translators: the question of the "Latinity" of the new version. Some of the writers who advocated a revision or a translation of the Psalter favored a type of Latin which would remain close to the *sermo vulgaris* of the *Gallicanum:* this was the form of language familiar to the readers of the Breviary; above all, it would continue, as it were, the "traditional" language of the psalms hallowed by its long use in the Church (cf. Bea, pp. 16, 41 ff., 127 ff., 133). Other writers had tried "classical" Latin—in varying doses of classicism, with results that at times could hardly be called satisfactory, cf. Bea, pp. 21 ff.). Fr. Bea's remarks on this subject of

[3] This is reproduced in the *Editio Americana* published by Benziger Bros. (New York, 1947).

the kind of Latin used in the new Psalter express common sense (cf. pp. 127 ff.). If Latin had still been a living language, the obvious solution would have been to adopt its modern form. Since it is a dead language, and since, in spite of some contrary claims, there is no definite set form of Ecclesiastical Latin which could be regarded as in any way really binding, the choice could only be a correct type of Latin respecting the rules of the classical language studied by all ecclesiastical students (cf. Bea, pp. 141 ff.). Its vocabulary would be essentially that of the classical period, with due recognition of words of special religious meaning, unknown of course to the classics, but necessary to express the new religious ideas (cf. Bea, pp. 146 ff.; 158 ff.). On the whole, then, in the question of the language, we find a wisely conservative attitude that should satisfy every reader of unprejudiced mind.

Fr. Bea's work contains many other details and illustrations which need not be repeated here. The reader who wishes to understand the new text more fully should evidently study this excellent introduction to the new Psalter and also have recourse to the original *Liber Psalmorum* with the translators' notes. The Psalter, approved for liturgical use, and reproduced now in the Breviary, without the critical and exegetical annotations, will make its way into general use, even without any formal decision of the Holy See. In the struggle for life, the new text is bound to conquer. The older generation which has grown up with the *Gallicanum,* acquainted with the wording of the psalms in their ancient form, will naturally tend to continue using the old editions of the Breviary. But the new generations will know only the new text, the only one which the liturgical editors can be expected to reproduce in the new editions of the Breviary. Thus, in a not distant future, the new Psalter will have supplanted the old text completely, and the *Gallicanum* will have only antiquarian interest. The new edition of the Psalter shows that the Church moves on and is willing to make changes for the better in accordance with new circumstances and needs. This encourages us to hope for still other changes in the Breviary, and even in the Vulgate. The new Psalter may, let us hope, be only the first instalment of a new Latin translation of the Old Testament. Many feel the need of such a translation—or, at least, of a thorough revision, for in many places the text of St. Jerome needs correcting, and many corrections could be made now with a high degree of confidence. Besides, as is known, several

books of the Vulgate were never translated or revised by St. Jerome. To mention only one case: the book of Ecclesiasticus is full of glosses, additions of various kinds and from different sources, and could be bettered in a considerable number of places. But limiting ourselves to the Breviary, may we hope that the revision of the Psalter is only a first step in a revision of the other parts as well? Many of the lessons of the Second Nocturn need revision according to the exigencies of historical criticism. The matter is delicate, but there is no doubt that it could be handled respectfully and efficiently by a revision committee of competent historians. Years ago, it was said that such a committee had been appointed to work under Msgr. Louis Duchesne, the great Church historian. If such a committee did really exist and begin work, it is quite possible that the disturbances of the last thirty years have stopped the undertaking. Be this as it may, let us hope that work will be done to cut out the unhistorical material found in the lessons of the Second Nocturn—and even to cut down some lessons, especially more recent ones, that are too long.

The Third Nocturn gives us homilies on the Scripture lessons, taken from the writings of the Fathers. The idea of course is excellent and it should be preserved. Yet all readers of the Breviary know that too often the interpretations are rather far fetched allegorical explanations which, edifying though they may be, could hardly be used nowadays. Or we have speculations about numbers, or about the meanings of words and phrases which have little to do with the literal sense. We would incline to look upon this as fanciful interpretations without practical value to us. Yet it is possible to preserve this feature of the Breviary and to make it something of really practical value. Instead of the antiquated selections, others could be substituted, from the writings of the Fathers and even from later authors, namely extracts giving the literal sense of the Scripture texts. It is not necessary to mention the names of Fathers whose interpretations followed more strictly the literal sense of Scripture. If necessary, why should not Maldonatus' excellent commentaries on the Gospels be put to use? He could supply us with fine "lessons" on the nature of the Parables, the rules of interpretation of the parables, beside many an explanation of individual parables. We should not exclude all symbolic interpretations of the Fathers which may contain much that could be of value even now: the problem is perhaps rather one of

presentation. The ancients viewed the numbers differently from us and saw in them meanings which our more matter-of-fact turn of mind prevents us from seeing. But in this the Fathers were better attuned to the minds of the Biblical writers and thus in a better position to appreciate the intention of the sacred authors. Thus we may admit the full historical intention of St. Matthew and of St. John, but this does not exclude the presence of symbols in their Gospels. As to St. John (whose use of numbers as symbols is evident from the Apocalypse), the numbers mentioned by him in his Gospel may be and probably are far more than just mathematical quantities, and we may rightly surmise that at times apparently irrelevant numbers stand in his text for reasons that are more than historical. Would it not be advisable therefore to give extracts from the Fathers stating their principles on the subject, the value of the numbers, the symbolic meaning and its coexistence with the historical value of the narrative? This would enable us to sympathize with their attitude, and even to penetrate more deeply into the sense of the Biblical author. We would thus be able to appreciate the lessons they draw from the Biblical texts—instead of seeing in their explanations the product of wild fancy and of a lack of historical sense.[4]

The Breviary modernized and adapted to our present needs in all its constituent parts, not only in the text of the Psalms, would remain the prayer book of priests and religious. It would also be endowed with a greater degree of practical value, for then it would be truly a handbook from which the clergy would be able to draw solid materials for the instruction of the faithful. Indeed the priest might not find ready-made sermons or homilies; but he would obtain a good idea of the correct literal sense of Scripture which can be developed and applied to the different exigencies of life by personal reflection and meditation on the literal sense. And this usefulness could be increased if a greater selection of "lessons" on the Scriptural texts could be provided, and if also a

[4] For an excellent and sympathetic study of the point, cf. Maurice Pontet, S.J.,: *L'Exégèse de St. Augustine prédicateur* (Paris, 1943), pp. 570 ff. This work is one of a series of theological studies of remarkable value published by the Jesuit Fathers in Lyons: *Théologie: études publiés sous la direction de la Faculté de Théologie s.j. de Lyon-Fourviere.* These and similar works are an eloquent witness to the continuity of intellectual activity in France during the war years and in spite of enormous difficulties.

greater degree of liberty in the choice of such readings could be left to the individual reader of the Breviary. This would obviate the too frequent repetition of the same readings which can only produce a feeling of monotony. The revision of the Second Nocturn would supply the priest with reliable historical material that could be used without fear in sermons on the Saints or supply him with solid illustrations for his sermons.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

CONFESSION

The real secret of all this clamor against the Confessional is found in the simple fact, that Confession is very hard to flesh and blood, exceedingly humbling to human pride. It is very painful to feel compelled to reveal our wicknedness to a fellow-creature as sinful as ourselves. But this very feature of Confession is perhaps the strongest proof of its divine origin. Christianity in its very nature wars against flesh and blood, and inculcates self-denial and humility. The practice of Confession is highly calculated to keep alive this feeling. How is it possible that man would and could ever have introduced a doctrine so very painful? How is it possible that mankind could have been persuaded to adopt a practice so very humbling, unless they firmly believed that Christ himself had enjoined it as a command, and as an essential condition for obtaining pardon of sin? Whoever knows anything of human nature, knows that however easy it may be to introduce changes for the worse, it is utterly impossible to persuade men to change for the better, without a clear divine warrant and sanction. We venture to say that all the preachers of all the warring sects in Christendom together would not be able, by joint combination and effort, to introduce any such change, or persuade even a dozen of their flocks to resort to Confession.

—Archbishop Martin John Spalding in *Miscellanea,* Vol. II (Baltimore, 1869), p. 451.

PREFRONTAL LOBOTOMY: ITS PRESENT MORAL ASPECT

Prefrontal lobotomy, a surgical procedure found useful in alleviating certain types of mental disorders, has come to the juncture in its history when a theological opinion on its morality seems possible and useful.

The opinion which we are about to state, let it be clearly understood, is one based on the knowledge of the facts as they now appear, and we must reserve a final appraisal of the morality of this surgical technique until the publication of more definite information by competent medical and psychological authorities. We do believe, however, that sufficient evidence is now at hand to justify our general conclusions, and we expect that further data will only enable us to narrow down and define more particularly the conclusions already reached.

DIFFICULTIES INVOLVED

The lag between the perfecting of the surgical technique itself and the amplifying of the knowledge of the precise psychological and personal changes resulting from the use of this technique has been only one of several difficulties encountered in formulating this opinion. The operation has caught the fancy of editors in the popular press, and the resulting publicity has been focused upon certain sensational aspects and results of the procedure. In describing these, the popular press has seized upon certain descriptive phrases which surgeons attached to the effects of the technique. Use of these inexact terms, never intended to be technical representations of the effects produced by lobotomy, has produced confusion in many minds. Understanding at least two of these terms in the light of what we consider proper usage may clarify such confusion.

Firstly, when the medical authors speak of "responsibility" and "irresponsibility" they do not mean *moral* responsibility consequent on the use of the intellect, the operation of the will, and freedom of choice. Their usage seems to denote what we would call carelessness or lack of interest; the moral aspect is never in view.

Secondly, the phrase "surgically induced childhood" has little reference to the powers residually present after lobotomy; it refers rather to the fact that the patient fresh from the operation needs training as he convalesces and begins to return to a fuller use of his emotions. This training consists largely in constant stimulation of interest and emotion in the patient, who has been left apathetic and inclined to inertness.

EFFECTS OF LOBOTOMY

That prefrontal lobotomy effects drastic changes in the personal characteristics is beyond doubt. For the moralist the important question is: do these changes, deliberately wrought, so affect the person that he is no longer capable of a human act, or, despite the deep and irreparable damage done, is the patient still sufficiently capable of producing a human act?

It is our opinion that the operation does produce serious changes by detracting from the emotional powers of the patient, but that the loss of such powers does not *per se* render the agent incapable of a human act and the recognition of moral responsibility. The loss of the emotional component of the patient's process of thinking is precisely what is sought by the surgeons. This emotional loss is the most noticeable aspect of the patient's behavior after he has recovered from the immediate effects of the operation and has begun convalescing toward the stable mental life he may achieve. Further, the effective psychoses that result from abnormal emotional states are the very ones which are most benefited, consequently on a release from the excessive emotional component of the process of thinking.

There is some doubt expressed about the effect of the operation on intelligence. We believe that the intelligence quotient is not materially lowered *per se,* and that an apparent loss of intelligence is traceable to the patient's lack of emotional interest in using his intelligence after lobotomy.

It is interesting to recall that no moralist at any time has demanded emotion as a formal component element of the human act. The formal requirements uniformly include only the full advertence of the intellect, the perfect consent of the will (i.e., the intellectual appetite), and the freedom of choice. None of these, apparently, is affected *per se* by the procedure of lobotomy.

Presenting the changes as expressed in scholastic terms familiar

to us, we say that the operation of prefrontal lobotomy diminishes the effect of the sensitive appetite. Immediately after the operation the patient seems to be entirely without the passions of the sensitive appetite; beginning some weeks after the operation and continuing over a course of time up to three years, the patient is convalescent and gradually recuperates until a very moderate measure of emotional response has been recovered. The operation only indirectly affects the powers that make man *formally human,* and may be roughly comparable to any operation resulting in a deprivation of sensitive power, although the lobotomy procedure attacks and damages powers higher than the physical but inferior to the properly human powers. The agent after lobotomy can still act rationally (ergo humanly), but with the imperfect co-operation of impaired and restricted animal potencies of the soul.

This deliberate diminution of the powers of the sensitive appetite does not seem so evil that it can never be permitted for a correspondingly good effect. This seems true (1) because the factor of emotion is never *per se* demanded by theologians as a formal element of human act. The usual course in Fundamental Moral considers only the inordinate movements of the sensitive appetite, antecedent or consequent concupiscence. It may be that the effects of this technique are going to result in the inclusion of a new principle explicitly stating the necessity of emotional motivation for the complete integrity of a human act. (2) The degree of emotional response that is frequently recovered yields a personality that is not at all uncommon: the patients may be unemotional, impassive, apathetic, or disinterested, but not to the degree that they exceed the placidity or stolidity of persons we judge to be normal although endowed naturally with a comparable degree of emotionality. The change from the pre-psychotic condition of the individual to the post-operative condition may be astonishing, but comparison of the post-operative condition of the patient with the natural condition of other men may not yield excessive differences.

THE MORALITY OF PREFRONTAL LOBOTOMY

The conclusion reached in this investigation is that the surgical technique known as prefrontal lobotomy is *per se* illicit, but licit *per accidens.*

We hold it illicit *per se* because the technique is a grave mutila-

tion, irreparable and uncertain of success, resulting in direct impairment of the sensitive appetite and perhaps indirect repercussions on the properly human powers. Even granting that emotion is not a necessary formal element of human act, the loss of emotional response is still a serious one, and the changes resultant upon the loss hamper the patient.

We hold that the technique may be licit *per accidens* in certain cases where due conditions are fulfilled. We argue thus by reason of the application of the principle of double effect. The good effect that is produced by relieving the patient of a crippling psychosis and by returning him to a materially more normal state than he enjoyed in his illness is sufficient to balance the evil effect of mutilating the patient. The technique, applied by doctors skilled in its use, has produced this good effect in a sufficiently high proportion of cases to render the effecting of a cure quite probable where capable diagnosis indicated its utility.

For liceity, the following conditions, in addition to the principle of double effect, must be observed:

(1) All other means of known and *applicable* therapy must have been found unavailing. We say *applicable* means of therapy because in some cases a given means of therapy, electro-shock, for instance, is contra-indicated.

(2) The patient must be suffering from a true psychosis of sufficient duration to convince competent medical authority that situational changes, or time alone, cannot effect a cure. This period of duration need not be extended until organic deterioration has set in.

(3) The psychosis must be affective in character, and truly disabling. In certain cases surgeons may demand that the psychosis be accompanied by aggressive or violent behavior, or suicidal tendencies.

(4) Where there is hope or intention of returning the patient to normal life, it is absolutely mandatory that there be available after the operation someone, family or friends, to care for the patient over a long period of time to help him by constant suggestion and emotional motivation to recover as far as possible his emotional powers. Lack of such re-training usually assures failure of the technique to produce good results.

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

The emotions are frequently means of repelling temptation and of aiding in the practice of virtue. It has been suggested that if a lobotomized person suffers a temptation, of self-abuse for instance, we will find that the operation has left him in such a condition that, lacking emotion, he cannot repel such urges and will consequently sin frequently.

We might observe firstly that such inordinate concupiscence of the flesh is itself an emotion, a passion, and that the intensity of such concupiscence ought, *a priori,* to be mitigated by prefrontal lobotomy along wtih other emotional reactions. The temptations ought to be less violent and therefore more easily overcome, even by recall of intellectual convictions or resolutions. We think that these temptations would be weaker, because some of the medical authors make quite a point of the fact that lobotomized husbands have eventually been able to return to normal sex life—as if such a recovery was not to be expected at all.

Granting the possibility of sins of this kind, however, we presume that they would occur only in isolated and individual cases and not as a necessary result of the lobotomy. Hence even if the occurrence be verified, it could not be turned into an argument against the procedure itself, but would have to be considered in individual cases where the circumstances are so disposed.

A second consideration involves the application of prefrontal lobotomy to the hopelessly insane who must be kept under restraint, in strong rooms, or in the back wards of the mental hospitals. As a result of the lobotomy such patients may become more tractable, may cease to do themselves bodily injury in their frenzies, eat regularly, and enjoy other material benefits without losing the psychosis that demands their being isolated from society. We believe that if competent medical authority diagnoses an emotional abnormality as the direct cause of such frenzies, the application of prefrontal lobotomy is lawful, even though only material benefits accrue to the patient and he remains hopelessly insane. We recognize the tremendous and fearful burden which this opinion lays upon medical men to prevent abuses and the wholesale practice of lobotomy upon the hopelessly insane; we are, however, willing to trust not only the ethics of the procedure, but also the ethics of the profession that is to apply it.

There still remains much that is unknown about prefrontal lobotomy and its possible use. We believe that the procedure has come to the stage where experiment is best left to men familiar with the technique. The reason is that no patient, otherwise hopeless, may be subjected to prefrontal lobotomy unless there is at least some hope engendered in experienced men that the result will be favorable. Applying the procedure without reason and merely to find out what will happen ought never to occur to the mind of any doctor, Catholic or not. Even those whom experience seems to qualify for the prosecution of justifiable experiment must remember that they are working, not upon mere animals, but upon fellow men endowed by God with the same rights that the surgeon himself enjoys and demands.

In concluding, we might point out to the Catholic psychologist that theologians, among others, badly need reliable data on the actual personality changes effected by prefrontal lobotomy. Someone competent in experimental psychology must provide the necessary data, expressed in terms common and familiar to scholastic usage.

PATRICK O'BRIEN, C.M.

Vincentian Fathers House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

FALSE EDUCATION

Every form of pedagogic naturalism which in any way excludes or weakens supernatural Christian formation in the teaching of youth, is false. Every method of education founded wholly or in part on the denial or forgetfulness of original sin and of grace, and in relying on the sole powers of human nature, is unsound. Such generally speaking, are those modern systems bearing various names which appeal to a pretended self-government and unrestrained freedom on the part of the child, and which diminish or even supress the teacher's authority and action, attributing to the child an exclusive primacy of initiative, and an activity independent of any higher law, natural or divine, in the work of his education.

—Pius XI in the encyclical, *Christian Education of Youth* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1939), p. 54.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

It is a commonplace among modern theologians who deal with the *tractatus de ecclesia* that this particular subject is treated quite inadequately in most of the current manuals. Canon Jacques Leclercq has voiced this complaint quite forcefully in his highly interesting book, *La vie du Christ dans son église.* He begins his study with the contention that

> As we usually find it [the treatise on the Church] in the manuals, it is a treatise mainly apologetical in character, but partly canonical also. Its principal aim is to prove that Christ founded a visible society, that this society is the Catholic Church, and that the Catholic Church centers around the Pope. Then there follow studies about the powers in the Church, and particularly about the powers of the Sovereign Pontiff, and about the principles governing the relations between the Church and the State. But there are many other things in the Church.[1]

Despite the fact that he over-simplifies his description of the current treatise *de ecclesia,* Canon Leclercq is indubitably correct in his contention that sacred theology has a great deal to say about the Catholic Church which is not contained in the contemporary manuals. Among other things, the contemporary text-books of theology most frequently omit or understress the divine teaching about the relations between the Church and the world. Strangely enough, that doctrine formed an integral and highly important part of early scholastic ecclesiology. From the thirteenth century until the eighteenth, there was never any question of removing it from the treatise on the Church of Christ. During the eighteenth century, however, this section gradually disappeared from the manuals. From the beginning of the nineteenth century down to our own time, the theological manuals have contained only the barest minimum of this teaching.

The omission or the understressing of this teaching has had a definitely ascertainable cause in the history of sacred theology. It has likewise had serious and highly unfortunate results. It will be the purpose of this paper to sketch the basic teaching on the interrelations of the Church and the world, the manner in which this teaching is to be found in the most important early monu-

[1] *La vie du Christ dans son église* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1947), p. 5.

ments of our scholastic ecclesiology, the causes of its decline in scholastic literature, and the unfortunate results which have followed upon that decline.

It is a truth of basic importance about the Catholic Church that, since the days of our first parents, there have existed upon this earth two distinct and mutually hostile organizations, the supernatural kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan, the group under the direction and the influence of "the prince of this world." This separation began only after the fall, when the family of Adam began to exist and to act as a social unit averted from God, its only ultimate and supernatural end. Original sin, it must be remembered, not only turned the individual child of Adam away from God, but also affected the family of Adam, as a social entity.

God, in His infinite mercy, made it possible for men, from the earliest days after the fall, to go out from this company which lay under the dominion of His chief spiritual enemy, and to enter into His own supernatural kingdom, the society which was to be headed by His divine Son. Entrance or incorporation into this new group was to be effected by a profession of faith in God, by the acceptance of divine public revelation. The divinely revealed message was chiefly concerned with the Messias, who was to be the head of the new household of God for all eternity. Hence the supernatural kingdom of God was, from the very outset, the company of Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Within this society there existed and operated the sanctity of Christ Himself. The Saints of the Old Testament acted with the help of that divine grace which was given to them by reason of the pre-applied merits of Christ. Thus entrance into this group was basically a step, and an essential step, in the salvation of man. The people who were favored with membership in this company were those who had been saved from the great company which lay under the dominion of Satan.

Ultimately, of course, salvation consists in the achievement of the beatific vision by one who had previously been in a position of aversion from God. It involves a final and irremoveable integration into the company of Christ, membership in the Church triumphant, and consequently an absolute and eternal removal from the evil of aversion from God.

This ultimate salvation begins from a proximate and real process

of salvation on this earth, a process whereby a person who has hitherto belonged merely to the family of Adam, and who has thus been turned away from God and placed under the domination of Satan, enters into the household of God which is the supernatural kingdom of Jesus Christ. The person who perseveres in this supernatural kingdom of God until the end of this earthly life is the only one who will achieve the ultimate and eternal salvation of the beatific vision. Thus the supernatural kingdom of God on this earth is and has been from the very outset the company of the saved.

Now it is an integral part of Catholic teaching, despite the fact that it has not been adequately stressed in many of the recent theological manuals in their treatise *de ecclesia,* that this supernatural kingdom of God, the congregation of the faithful in Christ, has been in existence on this earth since the days of our first parents themselves. Catholic doctrine teaches that the divinely revealed message given to this supernatural kingdom was added to from time to time during the ages that transpired between the days of our first parents and the advent of Jesus Christ Our Lord. It also holds that this message was completed in the divine doctrine which was preached by Our Lord and by His apostles.

Moreover, the internal structure of the kingdom itself underwent many modifications during the course of its history. From wholly unorganized beginnings, the kingdom eventually passed to the status in which one particular ethnic group was constituted as the chosen people. This politico-religious organization of the Jews was established as the social unit out of which the Redeemer of the world was to come. It was also the custodian of the divinely commanded worship of the old dispensation. This people, over and above all others, stood forth as the people of the ancient covenant, despite the fact that it was perfectly possible for a man, prior to the time of Christ's advent, to belong to God's supernatural kingdom on earth without having any connection whatsoever with the Jewish commonwealth.

The most important element in the meaning of the term "the true Church of Jesus Christ" is to be found in the truth that the existent and visible Catholic Church is, as it stands, the supernatural kingdom of God on this earth today. Or, to put the same truth in another way, the supernatural kingdom of Christ in its final status on this earth is absolutely identified with the Catholic

Church. Thus the visible Catholic Church is inherently and primarily the company of the saved, the society with which men must be associated if they are to enjoy the beatific vision. It is essentially the household of God, the company of Christ, within which alone men may find association with Our Lord on this earth.

And, by reason of the very fact that the Church is the kingdom of God on earth, it is and it will ever be a society definitely out of favor with the kingdom of "the prince of this world." The basic cause of opposition and persecution against the Church on the part of the world is and has always been the clear and unequivocal statement by the Church of the divinely revealed truth about itself and about its divine Founder. Ordinarily at least, if Catholics are willing to represent themselves as belonging to the world rather than to the unique kingdom of God on earth, the world will be perfectly willing to accept them as its own. It is only when the world encounters the accurate statement of the divinely revealed message about the Church, the teaching that this visible society is, by God's ordinance, actually necessary for salvation as the only divinely instituted and authorized religious society on earth, that unpopularity and opposition are encountered. It is the situation which Our Lord prophetically described on the night of the Last Supper.

> If the world hate you, know ye that it hath hated me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.[2]

It is perfectly certain, then, that the social organism which leads and will always lead the opposition against the Catholic Church is the "world" itself. The supreme direction of the corporate efforts made to counter the works of the Church belongs to "the prince of this world." Furthermore, it is of supreme importance to note that the battle for God and His truth in the religious sphere is and always will be waged by the Catholic Church itself, not by some alliance of the Church with other agencies of "good will" in this world.

The early scholastic ecclesiologists were quite explicit in their teaching about the existence of an *ecclesia Dei* and an *ecclesia*

[2] *John*, 15: 18-19.

Satanae, which have co-existed and which have been in a status of mutual conflict since the first days of the human race. They were equally strong in their insistence that the visible Catholic Church is actually the *ecclesia Dei,* the one and only company of the saved, in the era of the New Testament. Moneta of Cremona, a Dominican theologian of the thirteenth century, thus teaches the doctrine of the two *ecclesiae.*

Two *ecclesiae* are found in this world, according to the testimony of the Scriptures. One is the *ecclesia sanctorum,* about which we read in the first verse of Psalm 149: "Sing ye to the Lord a new canticle: let his praise be in the church of the saints." The other is the *ecclesia malignantium,* with reference to which we read that the Holy Ghost has said, through David, in the fifth verse of Psalm 25: "I have hated the assembly of the malignant." [3]

Moneta also brings out in all of its perfection the Catholic teaching that the Church of the New Testament is actually the continuation of the *ecclesia sanctorum* which had been in existence since the days of our first parents.

It is the teaching of Catholic men that the Church can be considered in two ways. In one way the Church is called the *congregatio fidelium* in such a manner that the *fidelis* is so designated in terms of the faith without any qualification whatsoever (*simpliciter*). But this faith is identical in the saints of long ago, who lived before the advent of Christ into the world and in those who have believed in Christ since His coming. . . . The times have changed, but the faith has not changed. They believed that Christ was going to come. We believe that He has come. When we consider the Church from this point of view, we are compelled to say that the Church began with the first just man, that is, with Abel. . . .[4]

Considered in its other aspect, the Church is called the *congregatio fidelium* in such a manner that the *fidelis* is thus designated, not in terms of the faith without qualification, but from the faith of Christ who has already been born of the Virgin, who has already suffered, etc. Considered in this way, the Church began from the coming of Christ, even before the passion and the resurrection, because He gave the Holy Ghost to the disciples even before the passion, as we show in the chapter about the Holy Ghost in the second section of this work. This is the Church which is now called Roman, the Church which began

---

[3] *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses* (Rome, 1743), Lib. V, cap. 1, p. 389.

[4] *Ibid.,* Lib. V, cap. 2, p. 408.

from Christ, whom Peter succeeded [as the visible head of the society] and which will remain thus until the end of the world.[5]

The doctrine thus presented by Moneta is what modern manuals teach all too succinctly in their allusions to two definitions of the Church militant, the one applying to the kingdom of God, the congregation of the faithful in Christ which has been in existence since the time of our first parents, and the other applying to the visible society of Our Lord's disciples, organized during the course of His public life on earth. Thus it has always been the teaching of Catholic theology that the society of Our Lord's disciples was not formed as an entirely new thing. This organization was fashioned to be what the kingdom of God on earth had always been, the one company of the believers, the association or brotherhood into which a man had to enter in order to be saved from the kingdom of Satan. The organization which Our Lord built around Himself is not merely the continuation of the old Israel, the assembly of the covenant, but it is the continuation and the final status on earth of God's militant kingdom.

For the older scholastic ecclesiologists, the immediate source of the teaching about the distinction between the Church and the world as between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan was the doctrine of St. Augustine, particularly that set forth in his *De civitate Dei.* The Augustinian Bishop of Benevento, James of Viterbo, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, brought this doctrine out in his treatise *De regimine christiano.* He begins by observing that the Church on earth and the Church triumphant in heaven do not constitute two societies, but actually form one and the same kingdom of God.

> These are not two kingdoms, but one kingdom, because there is one King over both, namely Christ who rules both, although in a different manner. For he reigns in the *ecclesia viatorum* through faith, and in the *ecclesia beatorum* through open vision. This kingdom is one by reason of the unity of its purpose and of its principle, although it is divided by reason of a diversity of condition. . .
>
> The kingdom of the world, which is called earthly, is opposed to the kingdom of God, because it has chosen earthly goods for itself as its own purpose. This is also called the kingdom of the devil, because the

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 409.

devil rules over it, for, as it is said in the book of Job, "He is king over all the children of pride," because through malice he rules over them, as Christ rules over the just through grace. . . But these two kingdoms, as far as men are concerned, are mingled together in this life, because the good are mingled together with the evil and the evil with the good. Both in like manner use temporal things and both together are afflicted equally with misfortunes until they shall be separated by the last judgment when each will receive his final end, as Augustine says in the eighteenth book of the *De civitate Dei.*[6]

James of Viterbo is quite explicit in his teaching that the two kingdoms have been in existence since the time of our first parents. He also insists that every person in the world belongs to one or the other of these two companies.

These two kingdoms originated from and were typified by Abel and Cain, and also the two sons of Abraham. There always have been men belonging to both kingdoms since the very beginning of the human race. Moreover the entire human race is contained within these two kingdoms, in such a way that each person must belong to one or the other of them.[7]

The fifteenth-century Carmelite theologian, Thomas Netter of Walden, is neither as clear nor as completely accurate as Moneta of Cremona and James of Viterbo in his explanation of the existence of God's kingdom on earth prior to the Incarnation. Netter wrote to refute the heretical teachings of John Wycliffe, an English priest who defined the Church as the company (*universitas*) of the predestined. Like many another controversialist, Netter weakened his own position somewhat by his anxiety to use the terminology and even the concepts of his adversary in his own presentation of the Christian message.

Netter admitted that there is "a certain kind of Church of all the elect." [8] He believed that this was the society which St. Augustine described frequently in the course of his works. The passage which he cites, however, is the one from the *De civitate Dei* in

[6] Pars I, cap. 1, in *Le plus ancien traité de l'église, Jacques de Viterbe, De regimine Christiano. Étude des sources et édition critique,* par H. X. Arquillière (Paris: Beauchesne, 1926), pp. 96 ff.

[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 98 f.

[8] *Antiquitatum fidei catholicae ecclesiae doctrinale de sacramentis* (Venice, 1758), Lib. II, cap. 10, p. 286.

which St. Augustine states that "The Church goes on in pilgrimage, amidst the world's persecutions and God's consolations, not merely from the time of the bodily presence of Christ and of the apostles, but from Abel, the first just man, whom his impious brother killed, and [it goes on] thence to the very end of the world." [9] Later in this same work, Netter presented his theory that this "Church of the predestined" is contained within the visible Church "as a wheel within a wheel." [10] The visible Church is the society of the baptized, the congregation which includes both good and evil members in this world. It is the reality which Our Lord described in the parable of the great net.[11]

Thomas Netter of Walden, writing against the Wycliffites, centered his attention on the Church militant of the New Testament. The teaching he tried to explain in terms of a twofold Church was exactly the same doctrine which the other scholastic ecclesiologists brought out with their twofold definition of the same society.

Another great fifteenth-century theologian, the Dominican Cardinal John de Turrecremata, wrote what is still by all means the best doctrinal explanation of the origin and the nature of Our Lord's Church. In his *Summa de ecclesia,* a masterpiece which has never been utilized in the history of scholastic theology to the extent it deserves to be, Turrecremata gives a magnificently complete and accurate teaching about the twofold origin of the Christian Church. He explains its beginnings as the society of the disciples, organized around Himself by Jesus Christ Our Lord, and then he shows how this society is actually the final status in this world of a company of believers in Christ which started from Abel. In turning back the objections of those who held that the *ecclesia sanctorum* began from Adam rather than from Abel, Turrecremata insisted that opposition to the kingdom of Satan was of the very nature of Christ's company in this world, and that such opposition was first manifest in the persecution and murder of Abel by Cain.[12]

This same concept of the Church of Christ as opposed throughout its entire history by the world, considered as the kingdom of Satan, is manifest in the works of the great counter-Reformation

[9] The citation is from Book XVIII, cap. 51.

[10] Netter, *op. cit.,* Lib. II, cap. 12, p. 299.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Summa de ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), Lib. I, cap. 27, p. 30r.

theologians. Invariably it carried with it an account of the origin of God's supernatural kingdom on earth in the days of our first parents. It was still current in scholastic theology in the early days of the eighteenth century, and it forms an integral part of Tournely's ecclesiology.

That teaching, however, has no longer been stressed since the middle of the last century. Its disappearance from Catholic theology can be explained, in part at least, by an unfortunate tendency to divide the treatise *de ecclesia* into two sections, the one "apologetical" and the other "theological." The nineteenth-century ecclesiologists considered it their duty to refute the main contention of liberal Protestantism, the erroneous teaching that Our Lord had never organized any religious society of His own. Unfortunately, however, they seem to have imagined that this preoccupation entitled them to leave out of their teaching on the foundation of the Church all that was not immediately requisite for this refutation. Hence the pre-existence of the Christian Church as God's supernatural kingdom on earth prior to the Incarnation, and the nature of the Catholic Church as this kingdom in its final and definitive state on this earth have been somewhat neglected in the popular ecclesiology of recent times.

The manoeuvre itself was quite unscientific. There is no reason whatsoever why any one section of ecclesiology should be designated as "apologetical" and cut off from what is called the "theological" portion of the treatise. It is perfectly true, of course, that there is ample historical as distinguished from specifically revealed evidence for the establishment of the Catholic Church by Jesus Christ Our Lord. This evidence with the conclusion to which it leads does not, however, in any way constitute the entire theological teaching about the origin and the basic nature of the Church.

The brotherhood of Catholics with the Saints of the Old Testament forms an integral part of the divinely revealed message about the Church. That fellowship can only be explained in terms of common membership in one company of believers, within which the faith itself remained one since the days of our first parents. The opposition of the world to the Church is a fact attested by Our Lord Himself. That opposition can only be understood adequately when it is known that the visible Church militant of the New Testament is actually God's supernatural kingdom on earth,

a company which has been in existence, and which has been opposed by the kingdom of Satan, since the earliest days of the human race.

When the complete theology of the Church's origin is rightly explained, the necessity of the Church for salvation is more perfectly understandable. The kingdom of God, opposed by the kingdom of this world, has always been and is of its very essence, the society of salvation. Men are saved from the company of Satan primarily by entrance into this supernatural kingdom. It is interesting to note that the confusion which has characterized some of the teaching on this thesis has appeared in theological literature only since the theology of the Church's origin has been presented in inadequate form.

The most important effect of this inadequacy in teaching about the origin of the Church and about the Church and the world has been the emergence of a kind of mitigated indifferentism. Those who forget that the Church is essentially God's kingdom on earth, ever striving for its supernatural objective against the hostile efforts of the world itself, have been prone to imagine that the visible Catholic society to some extent shares its functions with other organizations. They have formulated the concept of a vast struggle for God's service on earth, a struggle in which the army working for God consists of the Church and other organizations of "men of good will." They do not grasp the central mystery of God's teaching about the Church, the truth that this visible society, with its good and evil members mingled together during all the days of its earthly sojourn, is actually the kingdom which alone does God's will in the religious order. This, and this alone, is the company of Christ.

Canon Leclercq's somewhat summary description of the treatise *de ecclesia,* as this treatise stands in a good many modern manuals of sacred theology, takes no cognizance whatsoever of the divine teaching about the identity of the Church as God's kingdom on earth and about the relations of that supernatural kingdom with "the prince of this world" and the group subject to his influence. It is unfortunately all too probable that the impression many other theologians have formed of this treatise corresponds more or less exactly to that of the distinguished Belgian writer. If this be so, it is essential that the treatise should be enriched, so as to en-

compass within it an adequate teaching of the divinely revealed truth about the Church.

This enrichment of scholastic ecclesiology demands, first of all, an inclusion of certain teachings about the life of the Church which, although existent in theological literature, have not as yet been brought into the ordinary treatise *de ecclesia*. As examples of such teachings we may mention the theology of the local Church or diocese, and the theology of the place of religious congregations in the Church.

It is fully as important, however, that there should also be a reconsideration of that part of ecclesiology which is now termed merely or principally apologetical in nature. It is highly important that theologians should remember that, on the origin of the Church and on its discernibility, there is not merely a body of strictly historical evidence, but also a tremendous amount of specifically supernatural teaching. A man definitely does not understand all that God wills he should know about the origin of the Catholic Church if he is simply aware of the historical evidence "that Christ founded a visible society," and "that this society is the Catholic Church." He does not grasp all that God wills that he should know about the unity of the Church if he considers this unity merely as a visible note.

The historical evidence now set forth in the "apologetical" section of the treatise *de ecclesia* rightly belongs in this treatise. But, if the treatise is to be treated adequately, the evidence of divine revelation itself, the strictly theological evidence about the origin, the unity, and the character of the Catholic Church must be included also. That section of the treatise now commonly designated as apologetical is no more repertory of facile responses to non-Catholic arguments and jibes against the Church of Christ. Properly speaking, it is and it ought to be the fundamental part of the scholastic explanation of God's teaching about His supernatural kingdom on earth.

It is well to remember that, although scholastic theology itself has somewhat understressed the teaching about the Church and the world, that doctrine has been stated with the utmost clarity in a highly important pontifical document. On April 20, 1884, Pope Leo XIII issued his famous encyclical letter, *Humanum genus*. This encyclical condemned the powerful organization of the Freemasons precisely because, in the opinion of Pope Leo, this

group had come to act as the central and directive force in the campaign of the kingdom of Satan against Our Lord and against the supernatural kingdom of God on earth.

At this period, however, the partisans of evil seem to be combining together, and to be struggling with united vehemence, led on or assisted by that strongly organized and widespread association called the Freemasons. No longer making any secret of their purposes, they are now boldly rising up against God Himself. They are planning the destruction of the holy Church publicly and openly, and this with the set purpose of despoiling the nations of Christendom, if it were possible, of the blessings obtained for us through Jesus Christ Our Saviour.[13]

Pope Leo's accusations against Freemasonry are understandable only in the light of the Catholic teaching on the Church and the world, seen together with the doctrine on the origin of God's kingdom on earth during the lifetime of our first parents. Hence the encyclical itself opens with a vigorous statement of this truth.

The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other for those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, the true Church of Jesus Christ; and those who desire from their heart to be united with it so as to gain salvation must of necessity serve God and His only-begotten Son with their whole mind and with an entire will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose possession and control are all whosoever follow the fatal example of their leader and of our first parents, those who refuse to obey the divine and eternal law, and who have many aims of their own in contempt of God, and many aims also against God.

This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects; and with subtle brevity he expressed the efficient cause of each in these words: "Two loves formed two cities: the love of self, reaching even to contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God, reaching even to contempt of self, a heavenly one." At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardor and assault.[14]

[13] *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1908), pp. 83 f.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

We are, all of us, firmly convinced that the theology of our time will be gloriously enriched by the inclusion in the manuals of the doctrinal treasures resident in the great papal encyclicals. Unfortunately, however, when there is mention of the encyclicals in our time, there is a widespread tendency to think merely or at least primarily of the great social documents, like the *Rerum novarum* and the *Quadrigesimo anno*. Actually that tendency has done a great deal of harm to modern Catholic instruction. It is perfectly true that the men for whom Christ died need, and need badly, the social teachings of the Catholic Church. It is also true that our people and our priests must have the treasures of dogmatic truth, contained in encyclicals like the *Humanum genus,* the *singulari quadum,* and the *Mystici corporis.* Only when these documents are used more fully, and only when their content is brought into the theological manuals, will we find the type of adequate theological teaching on the Church about which Canon Leclercq has written and towards which he has contributed so effectively.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

ADAPTING THE CATHOLIC MESSAGE

The principles on which the new opinions We have mentioned are based may be reduced to this: that, in order the more easily to bring over to Catholic doctrine those who dissent from it, the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and, relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern popular theories and methods. Many think that this is to be understood not only with regard to the rule of life, but also to the doctrines in which the deposit of faith is contained. For they contend that it is opportune, in order to work in a more attractive way upon the wills of those who are not in accord with us, to pass over certain heads of doctrines, as if of lesser moment, or so to soften them that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held. Now, Beloved Son, few words are needed to show how reprehensible is the plan that is thus conceived, if we but consider the character and origin of the doctrine which the Church hands down to us.

—Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Testem benevolentiae,* issued on Jan. 22, 1899. In *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 442.

Answers to Questions

A RECENT DECREE OF THE HOLY OFFICE

Question: What decree did the Holy See recently issue in reference to "interfaith" meetings? What bearings will this decree have on conditions prevailing in our country?

Answer: The questioner evidently refers to a *monitum* issued by the Holy Office on June 5, 1948, the translation of which is as follows:

Since it has been found out that in various places, against the prescriptions of the Sacred Canons and without previous permission of the Holy See, mixed gatherings of non-Catholics with Catholics have been held, in which matters of faith have been discussed, all are reminded that it is forbidden by Canon 1325, §3, for both lay persons and clerics, whether secular or religious, to take part in these gatherings without the aforesaid permission. Much less is it permitted for Catholics to convoke and establish such gatherings. Hence, let the Ordinaries insist that these prescriptions be exactly observed by all.

There is still more reason for observing these rulings when there is question of what are called "ecumenical" gatherings, in which Catholics, whether lay persons or clerics, may under no circumstances take part without the previous consent of the Holy See.

Since however, both in the aforesaid gatherings and outside of them, even acts of mixed cult have not infrequently been performed, all are again admonished that any communication in sacred rites is absolutely forbidden, according to the norm of Canons 1258 and 731, §2.

Given at Rome, from the Holy Office, June 5, 1948.

PETER VIGORITA, *Notary*

(*Osservatore Romano,* June 6, 1948)

This decree contains nothing that is strictly new; it merely repeats very emphatically certain prescriptions already laid down by the Code in the canons cited. However, this present decree makes explicit mention of a point which is contained only in a general way in the code—namely, that clerics as well as lay Catholics are forbidden to take part in religious dicussions and conferences with non-Catholics unless they obtain due permission. Furthermore, this *monitum* speaks of the Holy See alone as the competent authority to grant this permission. It is true, Canon

1325, §3, states that in an urgent case the local Ordinary can grant permission for Catholics to participate in meetings with non-Catholics for the discussion of religious topics. The present decree is certainly not meant to eliminate this exception; nevertheless, its exclusive reference to the Holy See undoubtedly is intended to point out that an appeal to Rome must be regarded as the normal course of action by one who believes he has a reason to attend a religious discussion with persons of other beliefs. When therefore a priest or lay person in this situation has the time to refer to the Holy See (the Holy Office) before the meeting takes place, he is not justified in seeking permission from the bishop. Indeed, it is difficult to see how the bishop could validly grant permission in such circumstances. Some might question the obligation to use airmail in order to get in touch with the Holy See, on the score that this is an extraordinary means of communication (though personally I believe it to be an ordinary means nowadays). But at any rate, if the period before the meeting is to take place is so lengthy that the ordinary mails can get the petition to Rome and secure an answer in time, the appeal must be made to the Holy See. Certainly, priests or lay persons who regularly participate in the meetings in question can have no excuse for refraining from such an appeal.

It is not rash to assert that among the "various places" in which the meetings have taken place against the prescriptions of church law, the United States is included. In the course of the last five years the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* have carried many warnings against the dangers of the "interfaith" meetings. These warnings now have the clear support and approval of the Holy See; and surely no Catholic should be indifferent to this solemn admonition.

The Conference of Christians and Jews is an organization that offers occasions to which the warning of the Holy See is applicable. For example, their "trio teams" and their local "round tables" can with difficulty abstain from the discussion of religious topics even though their avowed purpose is the promotion of civil good will and neighborliness. For example, in a sample "trialogue" published a few years ago, one of the speakers asserted: "We all have a right to worship, but we do not all have to worship the same way. My worship is different from yours, but my right to worship is the same as yours." Surely, a statement of this nature is concerned with religion, and from the Catholic standpoint it is a most objectionable

statement, embodying the fundamental idea of indifferentism. Again, in a pamphlet issued under the auspices of the Conference of Christians and Jews we read of an incident that took place in a New York High School, at an assembly in which "the speakers were a priest, a minister and a rabbi. Each of them spoke for about ten minutes on 'The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man,' and stressed with eloquent simplicity and inspiring sincerity the common positive elements in all the faiths." This is an example of a meeting in which a Catholic could not take part without permission.

The second portion of the recent *monitum* of the Holy Office repeats the law of the Code forbidding all active participation of Catholics in non-Catholic worship, and permitting passive presence only for a grave reason. It also cites the canon forbidding the administration of the sacraments to heretics and schismatics. In this connection it is well to note that there is a tendency at the present time for Catholics to officiate as marriage attendants at non-Catholic weddings with little or no regard for the gravity of the reason required for such participation and cooperation. Priests charged with the care of souls could appropriately instruct and admonish their people on this matter.

It is sincerely to be hoped that this latest pronouncement of the Holy Office on a matter that is so pertinent to present-day American life will be seriously taken to heart both by priests and by lay people in our land. Loose thinking on religion has produced a large crop of sayings that are utterly at variance with Catholic principles—such as "Everyone has the right to practice any religion he chooses" . . . "It is not what one believes that counts but what he does." Catholic priests must vigorously oppose such false assertions, and unhesitatingly defend the basic truth that there can be only one true religion, and that is Catholicism.

THE PRIEST AND DIVORCED PERSONS

Question: In the April issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* certain norms were laid down to guide the Catholic laity in their associations with persons who have attempted marriage after a divorce. What norms could be proposed to guide priests in their relations with such persons? Let us take a concrete case. A Catholic woman has civilly married a divorced man. The couple subsquently come to reside in a distant parish, where their repre-

hensible status is at first unknown. The woman comes regularly to Sunday Mass, is a good supporter of the church, comes to the meetings of the altar society, attends parish social functions with her "husband" and is most friendly and respectful to the priests. Gradually the people of the parish become aware that her marriage is invalid in the eyes of the Church. What attitude should a priest adopt towards a couple in this situation, particularly toward the woman?

Answer: The general principle is that the priest must avoid two extremes. On the one hand, he must not manifest so severe an attitude toward the woman and her "husband" as to make them feel that their condition makes them hopeless outcasts from the Church, and thus discourage them from any attempts they might be inspired to make toward rectifying their unfortunate status. Such an attitude would surely be opposed to the gentle and merciful spirit of Christ, whom the priest is supposed to represent. On the other hand the priest may not be so benign and liberal in his relation towards such a couple as to give the impression that their matrimonial entanglement is of little consequence, so that for all practical purposes they can be treated in the same way as a couple who are properly married.

It is not easy to give particular rules to guide the priest, since so many circumstances enter into each individual case. However, the following are suggested as practical norms which will be applicable in most cases.

The priest may visit the home of such a couple for some business of an official nature—for example: to take the census, to attend the sick member of the family, or of course, to urge either or both of the involved parties to return to the observance of God's law. But he should avoid purely social visits. If he is invited to dinner, he should courteously decline. It would usually be a cause of grave scandal if it were known that a priest for merely social reasons visited a home where the couple are actually living in concubinage and thus treated them as if they were truly husband and wife.

Any public announcement designating the couple as husband and wife must be avoided when it is publicly known that they are invalidly married. Thus if they make a donation to the church, there should be no printed statement that "Mr. and Mrs. Smith have contributed $100." Indeed, even if the wife alone gave the contribution, it would be scandalous to record her as "Mrs. Smith."

If people in the situation we are considering wish to make a donation, it should be made known to them very clearly beforehand that the gift will be recorded as coming from an anonymous benefactor. The priest of all men must be careful not to give occasion to the notion that money covers a multitude of sins.

If the couple (or either one) attends Mass, no objection should be made by the priest and he can even greet the individual or the couple courteously, though he should try to avoid calling the woman "Mrs. Smith." I think, however, that he could use this designation in certain circumstances, if otherwise great embarrassment would follow, as when he is required to introduce the lady—though, I presume some outspoken members of the clergy might on such an occasion refer to her as "the so-called Mrs. Smith." If the couple attend a social function, such as a church bazaar, they may be permitted to circulate freely among the people, but no special attention should be given them by the priests. Moreover, divorced persons should not be allowed to take any active part in preparing for the affair or in conducting it—for example, by working at one of the tables.

A Catholic who is publicly known to be living in an invalid conjugal union cannot be admitted to membership in any association under the auspices of the Church, such as the sodality or the altar society. The mind of the Church is quite clearly expressed on this point by the Code, which declares that public sinners cannot be received validly into religious associations of the laity (Can. 693, § 1). It seems hardly necessary to state that a person in this category should never be allowed to play the organ or to sing in the choir. If the priest discovers a situation of this kind already in existence, he would not be bound to expel the individual in question dramatically from the society or the choir, but he should privately request the undesirable person, in a kind but firm manner, to abstain in future from this form of association.

A deplorable laxity regarding the permanence of the marital union prevails in our land today. Divorce and remarriage, not only once but several times in the case of many Americans, has become a common situation. Hence, it is incumbent on priests, the official defenders of the law of God, to be on their guard lest they give the impression that the Catholic Church has departed from her

traditional stand regarding the sacredness and indissolubility of the bond of Christian marriage.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

EASTER AND THE PASSOVER

Question: The celebration of the Christian Pasch coincides with the celebration of the Jewish Pasch. However, this year (1948), the Jewish Pasch is observed one month later than the Christian Pasch. What is the reason for this discrepancy in the time of the observance between the Christian Pasch and the traditional Jewish Pasch?

Answer: Easter Sunday is always observed on the Sunday which follows the first full moon which comes after the vernal equinox. Hence, it may come as early as March 22 or as late as April 25. The Jewish calendar consisted fundamentally of twelve lunar months, alternately of 29 and 30 days each. Since this produced a year of only 354 days, various compensations had to be adopted to accommodate it to the mean solar year of 365 days. One of these corrections was the introduction of an intercalary month which was arranged so that the 14th day of Nisan, the Passover day, would not arrive too early but would fall after the vernal equinox when the sun was in the constellation of Aries. There was no fixed rule based on astronomical principles for the insertion of this intercalary month, the Sanhedrin determining in each instance when it was to be added, acting to some degree according to the forwardness or backwardness of the season, so that the young lambs would be ready for the sacrifice.

In the early days of the Church, the Christian Pasch coincided with the Jewish Passover. It was not long, however, before the great Easter controversies arose. The earliest of them concerned the observance of Easter on the fourteenth day of Nisan, the Jewish holy day, which might occur on any day of the week, or its celebration always on a Sunday. The present rule of observing Easter on the Sunday following the full moon which comes after the spring equinox dates from the Council of Nicea, though varying methods of calculating the lunar cycles and other reasons led to divergent results which prolonged the Easter controversy several centuries after the Council of Nicea.

Contrary to the assumption contained in the question, the Church tries to avoid an exact coincidence of the Christian Easter

and the Jewish Passover. This precaution is provided in the regulations for the calculation of Easter from the epacts and the dominical letter. (Cf. *De anno et ejus partibus,* in front of the winter volume of the Breviary.) When the fourteenth day of the spring moon comes on Sunday itself, it is the following Sunday which is observed as the Christian Easter, "ne cum Judaeis conveniamus qui Pascha celebrant die xiv Lunae." Despite this caution, however, the two feasts occasionally coincide, as in 1954, when April 18 is the date for both Easter Sunday and the first day of the Passover.

RINGING THE BELL AT MASS

Question: There seems to be some diversity of practice in the times for ringing the bell at Low Mass. In addition to ringing the bell at the *Sanctus* and the elevations, in some places it sounds also at the unveiling of the chalice and at the little elevation before the *Pater noster.* What are the official regulations on the subject?

Answer: The rubrics of the Missal (*Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*) provide for the ringing of the bell on only two occasion, at the *Sanctus* and at each elevation. In addition, a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (Oct. 25, 1922) sanctions the custom of ringing the bell as a warning shortly before the consecration. This is usually done at the *Hanc igitur* but in some places not till the *Quam oblationem.* Ringing the bell at the *Domine non sum dignus* as a signal for communicants to come to the altar is almost universally practised though nowhere prescribed. Sounding the bell at the unveiling of the chalice after the Offertory verse or at the little elevation preceding the *Pater noster* is entirely a matter of local custom, not generally observed.

MUST THE TABERNACLE VEIL BE OPAQUE?

Question: Is it permissible to use material such as gold lace for the tabernacle veil or does this have to be of closely woven material? A lace veil would allow the outline of the tabernacle structure to be seen and would seem to be better adapted to tabernacles of exceptionally fine construction.

Answer: The Ritual (Tit. IV, Cap. i, 6) simply requires that the tabernacle be covered by a veil (*conopaeum*). There is no

definite prescription as to the material of this veil. Authors generally recommend a rich fabric like silk or brocade or cloth of gold or silver. The letter of the law would be fulfilled by a conopaeum of gold lace, provided that it envelop the tabernacle. The idea of the veil is evidently that it give the tabernacle the semblance of a tent, covering the entire exterior, front and back and sides and top. This is accomplished even if the veil be not of opaque material.

As to the color of the *conopaeum,* it may be always white, which is the color proper to the Blessed Sacrament, or it may vary in color with the vestments of the office of the day. A black tabernacle veil is never used, violet being employed when black vestments are worn (cf. S.R.C., 3035, 10, and 3562). Since cloth of gold is a legitimate substitute for white, red, and green, and since the tabernacle veil may always remain white instead of varying with the color of the day, we are of the opinion that gold lace, metallic gold threads being understood, may always be legitimately used as the material for the tabernacle veil.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE INTERCESSION OF MARY

The world will never know how often it has been saved from destruction by Mary's intercession. There is scarcely a country on earth, whose villages, towns, and cities do not recognize and testify by public monuments to the fact that they have been saved by Mary's intercession from some terrible scourge, plague, famine, earthquake, conflagration, flood, or some of the many other disasters with which God punishes men's sins. Neither is there a Christian who in one way or another has not been the recipient of God's mercy through Mary's goodness. The world is growing older, but can we say that it is advancing in virtue? Yet God's punishments are not so severe or so frequent as they were before Christ came on earth. What is the reason? Does it mean that immutable God has changed? No, it means that now we have Mary for our Advocate.

—The Rev. Nicholas O'Rafferty, in *Discourses on Our Lady* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948), pp. 170 f.

Analecta

The March number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* publishes the epistle of our Holy Father, dated Feb. 18, 1948,[1] sent to the Hierarchy of the United States in behalf of the new North American College. The letter recalled that it was Pius IX who nearly a hundred years ago first proposed to the American bishops that they should establish a national seminary in Rome and that it was he who purchased and granted the use of the edifice that since that time has housed the students of the United States studying in Rome. It adverted to the fact that the first steps towards the establishment of the seminary were taken on the occasion of the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and that the college itself was opened on the very eve of the Feast, Dec. 7, 1859. Our Holy Father blessed the plans for the future of the seminary and sent his Apostolic Blessing to the Hierarchy, the priests, and the laity of the United States.

The same number of the *Acta* contains the Apostolic Constitution subjecting the Archdiocese of Washington immediately to the Holy See, separating it from the Archdiocese of Baltimore with which it had been *aeque principaliter* united. The Constitution is dated Nov. 15, 1947.[2] It joined to the Archdiocese of Washington the following Maryland counties: Montgomery, Prince Georges, Charles, Calvert, and St. Mary's. It conferred on the Archbishop of Washington the office of Chancellor of The Catholic University of America, but provided that he shall attend the provincial meetings of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

In this number of the *Acta* there is also found the Apostolic Constitution dated Nov. 15, 1947,[3] establishing the Diocese of Austin from territory withdrawn from the Archdiocese of San Antonio and the Dioceses of Galveston and Dallas.

The pastoral exhortation of our Holy Father delivered to the clergy of Rome on March 10, 1948,[4] began with a recognition of the fruitful ministry of the priests of the Eternal City and an assurance that they were never far from his thoughts, involved though

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XL (1948), 108.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 100.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

he was with the problems of the faith throughout the world. In the exhortation our Holy Father lamented the ignorance of the truths of faith apparent not only in Italy but throughout the world, caused in large measure by the addiction of the people to the wonders of the machine age, especially the motion pictures, in which they see a dramatic cross section of life, appealing because it gives importance to existence which might otherwise seem a mere succession of monotonous trivialities. To remedy this evil, our Holy Father urged pastors to have a thorough knowledge of every family in their parishes, to enlist the aid of competent catechists, to give personal instruction at least in the higher classes, and to make Christian heroism as dramatic in its presentation as the exploits of the heroes of the screen are made through that medium. He further stressed the importance of a restoration of the devotional practices necessary to a Christian mode of living: the reign of the crucifix in every home; daily family prayer; devout assistance at the liturgical functions on feast days; and the frequentation of the sacraments. He turned at length to the approaching elections and emphasized the duty of the clergy to inform the faithful of their grave obligation of voting according to their consciences, that is, of voting for those who offer adequate guaranty of the protection of the rights of God and of souls. Beyond this, however, the priests were warned by him to refrain from bringing political questions into the pulpit, from which the people have a right to hear how to live a Christian life in accordance with the precepts of Christ. In concluding, our Holy Father insisted that they must not succumb to the pessimism of the day, but rather they must look to the horizon where dawn can already be seen, the prelude of the coming of the Sun of Truth, of Justice, and of Love.

In giving the Easter blessing *Urbi et Orbi*,[5] our Holy Father emphasized the need of courage, combined with vigilance. He also took advantage of the occasion to point to the Church as a sign to be contradicted, enumerating the ways in which she is accused of doing the very opposite of what she has done and of favoring the very things which she has condemned.

On March 18, 1948,[6] our Holy Father sent a congratulatory letter to His Eminence, Luigi Cardinal Lavitrano, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, on the occasion of the golden

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

jubilee of his ordination; to honor a similar occasion, our Holy Father sent a letter on April 4, 1948,[7] to His Eminence, Giuseppe Cardinal Bruno.

Three other congratulatory letters are published in the March number of the *Acta*. On Dec. 5, 1947,[8] our Holy Father sent a letter to the Ministers General of the three branches of the Franciscan Order, honoring the Poor Clares in the commemoration of the fifth centenary of the death of St. Colette of Corby. On Jan. 15, 1948,[9] he sent a letter to the Bishop of Autun, Châlon-sur-Saône, and Mâcon, to commemorate the third centenary of the first preaching in Autun of St. John Eudes. On March 10, 1948,[10] he sent a letter to His Eminence, John Cardinal de Jong, Archbishop of Utrecht, to honor the Exposition conducted by the Catholic schools of Batavia in observance of the hundredth anniversary of the granting of freedom of education to the Catholics of that city.

On April 5, 1948,[11] our Holy Father delivered a sermon to the faithful assembled in Rome for the beatification of Blessed Brother Benildus, of the Christian Brothers. In it our Holy Father pointed to his example, urging all to learn from it that the true observance of the rule is, for a religious, the avenue to great sanctity and that outstanding holiness can be achieved even in the absence of spectacular heroism. He adverted to the fact that Brother Benildus was able to achieve sanctity in the midst of an active life as a religious, a teacher, and a director, during which he was beset by the practical difficulties that such a life entails and during which an unmistakable characteristic of his relations was a marked and easily recognized charity towards his neighbor. In the midst of these labors he lived in constant union with God; this, our Holy Father intimated, explains his constancy in fidelity to his duties and in the practice of all the virtues. Now, not only will his example guide his brothers, but his intercession will obtain an increase of the spirit of St. John Baptist de la Salle, the founder of the Institute of which he was so worthy a member.

By an Apostolic Constitution of Nov. 29, 1947,[12] a cathedral chapter was established in the Diocese of Tucumán, Argentina, the endowment of which is to be provided by the Government. The canons will be obliged to recite in choir only the little hours.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 104.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 106.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 110.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 144.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

An Apostolic Constitution of Dec. 13, 1947,[13] recognized anew the status of the Abbey of Einsiedeln, Switzerland, as an Abbacy *nullius,* and, even though it does not consist of three parishes, conceding to it the application of the law of the Code affecting abbacies *nullius.*

On March 6, 1948,[14] our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the Argentinian Ambassador when the latter presented his credentials. The allocution noted with satisfaction that the Argentinian Constitution proclaims God as the Font of all reason and justice and accords to the Catholic religion a place of honor. It recalled that Argentina showed its humane sentiments by being among the first nations to abolish slavery and that its devotion to Christian culture was apparent from its establishing in 1614 in Córdoba the second university in South America. Our Holy Father expressed his gratitude for the aid given in the amelioration of the misery caused by the war, as well as the assurance that the noble sentiments of Christian charity manifested by the Argentine nation in the past will continue to bear fruit in the future.

Apostolic Letters of Aug. 12, 1947,[15] raised the Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel in the Diocese of Sant' Angelo in Vado to the rank of a minor basilica.

Appointments of bishops made by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation and published in the April number of the *Acta*[16] included the following: Nov. 29, 1947: Most Rev. Francis P. Keough, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore; Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., Archbishop of Washington; Most Rev. Louis J. Reicher, D.D., Bishop of Austin; Feb. 28, 1948: Most Rev. Thomas A. Connolly, D.D., previously Titular of Sila and Auxiliary of San Francisco, now Coadjutor of Seattle with the right of succession; March 13, 1948: Most Rev. Edward C. Daly, O.P., D.D., Bishop of Des Moines; Most Rev. John F. Dearden, D.D., Titular Bishop of Sarepta and Coadjutor of Pittsburgh with the right of succession; Most Rev. Leo J. Steck, D.D., Titular of Ilium and Auxiliary of Salt Lake City; and Most Rev. Leo Fahey, D.D., Titular of Ipsus and Coadjutor of Baker City with the right of succession.

By a decree of Jan. 25, 1948,[17] the Sacred Congregation of Semi-

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 142.
[14] *Ibid.,* p. 112.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 102.
[16] *Ibid.,* pp. 151, 152.
[17] *Ibid.,* p. 158.

naries and Universities raised the Irish College in Rome to the rank of a Pontifical College.

Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites provided, on June 13, 1947,[18] for the introduction of the Cause of the Servant of God, Joseph Maria Yerovi, a member of the Friars Minor and Coadjutor of the Archbishop of Quito; passed favorably on the proof of the practice of virtue on the part of Venerable Antonio Maria Pucci, a member of the Order of the Servants of Mary (Jan. 18, 1948);[19] and accepted the two miracles required for the canonization of Blessed Jeanne de Lestonnac, Foundress of the Order of the Daughters of the Blessed Virgin (March 19, 1948).[20]

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS*

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

Sept. 6, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. William C. Humphrey, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Oct. 12, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Isidore J. Semper, John W. Howell, and William H. Schulte, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

Oct. 29, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph A. Foley, Henry F. Hammer, Emmett F. Rogers, Martin J. Drury, Valentine F. Snyder, and Thomas F. Temple, of the Archdiocese of New York; George A. Hammes, of the Diocese of La Crosse; John Sheedy, Adalbert A. Jagodzinski, and William P. White of the Diocese of Peoria.

Nov. 1, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. James F. Byrnes, Walter H. Royer, and Francis J. McCormack, of the Diocese of Mobile.

Nov. 27, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Aloysius McCue, of the Diocese of Camden.

Nov. 28, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Lawrence B. Casey, Joseph J. Baierl, William H. McPadden, William Brien, Francis J. Lane, Edward J. Byrne, Walter J. Donoghue, John A. Conway, Edmund A. Rawlinson, William F. Stauder, Joseph A. Balcerak, Edward M. Lyons, Thomas F. Conners, John B. Sullivan, Adolfo L. Gabbani, William E. Cowen, George W. Eckl, and Wilfrid Craugh, of the Diocese of Rochester.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

Oct. 29, 1947: Very Rev. Msgrs. Emil Komora, John E. Reilly, and Christopher J. Weldon, of the Archdiocese of New York; Leo P. Henkel and Leo J. Wissing, of the Diocese of Peoria.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 122. [19] *Ibid.*, p. 153. [20] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

Nov. 27, 1947: Very Rev. Msgr. William Hickey, of the Diocese of Camden.

Nov. 28, 1947: Very Rev. Msgrs. Gerald C. Lambert, James C. McAniff, and John S. Randall, of the Diocese of Rochester.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Sept. 24, 1947: Michael Francis Doyle, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Sept. 30, 1947: Bernard Ficarra, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Nov. 27, 1947: Daniel Barse, William Boyle, Patrick Courtney, and Glendon Robinson, of the Diocese of Camden.

Commander of the Order of St. Sylvester Pope:

Nov. 7, 1947: Lawrence Caputo, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Privy Chamberlain Supernumerary of the Cape and Sword:

April 4, 1946: Raymond J. Towle, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE FIELD OF RELIGION

All acts by which man subjects himself to God, whether they are acts of mind or body, pertain to religion. But because those things that are rendered to the neighbor on account of God are rendered to God Himself, it is evident that they also pertain to this same subjection in which religious worship consists; and so to one diligently considering the matter it is apparent that every good act pertains to religion . . . First and foremost, those acts of the mind ordained to God pertain to the worship which we are speaking of. Secondly, there are acts of the body intended to arouse reverence of mind or to give expression to it, such as prostrations, sacrifices, and the like. Thirdly, there also pertain to divine worship all other acts ordained to the neighbor for the sake of God.

Nevertheless, as magnanimity is a certain special virtue, although it uses the acts of all virtues . . . so also religion is a special virtue in the acts of all the virtues, considering a special aspect of its object, namely, that which is due to God; and thus it forms a part of justice.

—St. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius,* Qu. III, art. 2. In *The Trinity and the Unicity of The Intellect,* translated by Sister Rose Emmanuella Brennan (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946), pp. 85 f.

Book Reviews

GROWTH OR DECLINE? THE CHURCH TODAY. By Emmanuel Cardinal Suhard. Translated by James A. Corbett, with a Foreword by John Courtney Murray, S.J. South Bend and Montreal: Fides Publishers, 1948. Pp. 109. Cloth binding, $2.00; paper binding, $1.00.

Few pastoral letters have arrested international attention as has that which the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris addressed to his people last year. A commentary on the crisis confronting the Church in France, it proves to be an analysis, unique alike in the authority of its author and the profundity of its thought, of the state of the Church in the present world and of the probable lines of her future progress and service.

It is difficult to summarize a work already so succinct. His Eminence faces three basic facts in his letters: Humanity is confronted with the end of a world. "Something is dead on the earth which will not rise again." Nonetheless, the era in which we live is somehow a prologue, the prelude to the drama of a world in formation. "The suffering which affects the whole world, the dangers which threaten its future, the strong currents which sweep over it are less the consequences of a catastrophe than the warning signs of a new birth." In the interim, established traditions, consecrated values are being tested and broken; out of the testing, sometimes violent, always radical, a structural reform is taking place in all society, but especially "Western society." "The world is in revolution." Its *unity* is under attack and yet in process of realization; we are passing through a worldwide *crisis of unity*.

A twofold question confronts the Cardinal as eventually it must every thoughtful Catholic: will the Church form the soul of its new unity which appears everywhere in process of emerging? What will be the relation between ancient Catholicism and this new, revolutionary social order? The answer to the first finds believers and unbelievers opposed; the answer to the second divides, sometimes unhappily, the household of the faithful.

Unbelievers affirm that the Church is destined to die, that in point of fact the signs of her mortality are already all about us. The Cardinal, of course, does not accept this contention but the arguments he marshals for it are sobering indeed; one thinks of the technique by which Robert Hugh Benson used to build up the case against the Church's position in so many of the novels in which he aspired to present the case for the Church. But even as the eminent author asserts his own conviction that the Church will, even *must* shape the essential unity of the society coming into being, he candidly exposes

the divided position of Catholics themselves with regard to the relation between the Church and the *crisis in unity* through which society is passing. It is undoubtedly this particular part of the pastoral which is of greatest interest to the thoughtful devout everywhere.

One school of Catholic thought, we discover, calls for a breaking with the world—a *fuga mundi*—and a tactic of strict defensive warfare against revolution's threat to the values Catholicism contains and communicates. The partisans of this position despise the menace of the new order. "Like all systems this one will have its day. Let the storm pass. Truth always triumphs in the end. The Church has known other crises; she is not afraid of this one. The great danger the Church is running today, they say, is in wishing to adapt herself. She must resist this perpetual temptation. It is not for her to adapt her teaching but for civilization to assimilate it. Let her strengthen therefore her intransigence. . . . The only attitude for the Church is to break with the world." "Truth" in all its hardness, "Truth" without flinching from hurt or fearing to hurt—this must be the sole standard of the uncompromising Church, embattled, aloof, defensive.

The other school of Catholics fears Constantine less than Nero. Humanistic, conciliatory, this school fears lest the Church remain frozen in feudal forms. They deplore any attitude toward the times which would leave the Church as something which "hovers over humanity instead of being incarnate in its flesh and blood." These faithful contend that fearfulness should never characterize the indestructible Church: "In her message to men she has everything needed to animate the contemporary structures and to draw up plans for the future, but she does not use her resources. . . . She must become incarnate: 'God became man in order that man might become God.'" On this latter premise, the Church must become "incarnate" in successive civilization if she is to fulfill her divinely intended function to be the unifying as well as the sanctifying principle of the world.

So, stated in terms of two questions, the rival schools of Catholic thought in the face of the world crisis, are these: Shall the Church remain *rigid* in order to safeguard all, or shall she *permeate* all in order to win it to herself? These, says the Cardinal, are the two poles of Catholic opinion at the moment, at least in France. American readers will recognize that these two schools find kindred disciples among some in this country, too, and may even recall the presentation of one side, at least as against the other, of a like controversy in this very *Review* not so long ago.

Cardinal Suhard presents the contrasting positions with admirable detachment . He rebukes those of both camps who indulge in excommunications of one another and he comments on the evil to the Catholic cause which must necessarily result from undue or prolonged

division. He acknowledges the truth at the core of the first thesis (p. 48), and yet in his own presentation of the theology and history of the Church he appears to sympathize with certain essential postulates of the second (cf. esp. p. 29). His own synthesis is arrived at through an extended meditation on the Theology and History of the Church. In a chapter reminiscent in matter as well as title of Père Clerissac's "The Mystery of the Church," the distinguished prelate prepares for his evaluation of the problems incidental to the over-all problem of the relationship of the Church to the crisis which occasions his pastoral: the Church and Civilizations, the voice of the Popes and the Bishops, the falling away of the masses in France, the growth of an elite, the problem of Modernism, the question of "Intergralism." Especially rewarding are the Cardinal's observations on the preference of the Church for Thomism and the paragraphs on "the humanism which the Church offers man." Provocative of much meditation are the concluding sections on "the commitments of Christians" and on "the triple plan of action" in the modern Catholic apostolate.

A theological and philosophical essay, the Cardinal's pastoral provides indispensable and authoritative background for the reading of the numerous books currently concerned with the forces at work within the Church in France, e.g., Perrin's *Priest Workman in Germany* and (more popular) Bishop's *France Alive*. An inspiring pastoral, the Cardinal's book merits long hours of study and will impel the reader to conclude it on his knees. It ends with collects from the liturgy of Good Friday and of Holy Saturday.

✠ JOHN WRIGHT

TWENTY-FOUR AMERICAN CARDINALS. Biographical sketches of those Princes of the Catholic Church who either were born in America or served there at some time. By Brendan A. Finn. With a foreword by Francis Cardinal Spellman. Boston: Bruce Humphries, Inc., 1947. Pp. 475. $5.00.

It is now twenty-two years since the slender volume of popular essays entitled *Our American Cardinals* (New York, 1926), was published by the late James J. Walsh. In the meanwhile no effort has been made to chronicle the lives of the American cardinals except the brief biographical sketches of these churchmen which appeared in Joseph B. Code's *Dictionary of the American Hierarchy* (New York, 1940). There is a place, therefore, for a work which would set down the deeds of the princes of the Church who have been born in, lived in, or were in some way connected with the United States. The volume under review undertakes to give in biographical accounts varying in

length from around ten to thirty pages the story of twenty-four cardinals. Of these eleven were or are archbishops of American sees; two were bishops of the United States before being made cardinals; six served as representatives of the Holy See in the United States; three more acted as auditors of the Apostolic Delegation at Washington, and there were two members of religious orders who spent some time in the country in their earlier years before the Roman purple was conferred upon them. They cover in time a period of over seventy years, from 1875 when John McCloskey of New York received the red hat down to February, 1946, when that high honor was conferred on four American archbishops.

In his preface Mr. Finn states his objective as follows: "My hope has been to avoid producing a reference work but rather to produce one that will interest many types of reader and thus serve to make the lives and deeds of these good men better known and better appreciated" (pp. 10 f.). He states that he has tried to write his book with the injunction of Leo XIII in mind that, "the first law of History is not to tell a lie; the second not to fear to tell the truth" (p. 10). Certainly no more admirable standard could have been chosen than that laid down by Leo XIII in his letter on historical studies of August, 1883, but the hope of the author that his book would avoid becoming "a reference work" will, of course, inevitably fail of attainment. There is and always has been a widespread curiosity about members of the College of Cardinals and since there is so little in English about its present and past membership students will employ this volume as a work of reference long after it has been forgotten by those who will read it merely for pleasure or out of curiosity. For that reason it is all the more unfortunate that in a number of respects the book of Mr. Finn will not prove a safe guide for factual data on the subjects he treats.

The spirit and tone of the volume will hardly satisfy the requirements of even the popular reader who wants his history straight. The text is interlarded with pious reflections and philosophizing which have no place in a work of this kind. For example, in speaking of the devastating effects of the French Revolution on the Church still prevalent in the Roman student days of Cardinal McCloskey, the author interjects the statement: "Whenever truth has seemed barren and authority overcome by human frailty, the grace of Christ, its Divine Founder, has never failed to bring forth from the womb of the Mystical Body members who by the power of their faith have given new life not only to those around them but to the whole Church" (p. 24). True, but does this sort of reflection add anything to John McCloskey's story? Again, in the sketch of Cardinal Dougherty we read that he was ordained in Rome and celebrated his first Mass in St. Peter's. This circumstance

prompts Mr. Finn to the remark: "Considering the course Father Dougherty's life later took and the fact that he has ever since been noted for his devotion and fidelity to the Holy See, it seems deeply significant that he should have offered his first Mass at the Chair of St. Peter" (p. 125). The present Archbishop of Philadelphia would probably be the first to state that his loyalty to the Holy See is that of every right-thinking Catholic bishop and that there is little of significance between the offering of his first Mass in St. Peter's and his lifelong loyalty to Rome. Again, the author regards as "significant" the fact that Cardinal Hayes preached the sermon he delivered in taking possession of his titular church of Santa Maria in Via in English (p. 184). There is nothing particularly significant about that fact when it is known that Cardinal Hayes did not feel at home in speaking either Latin or Italian before public gatherings. Other examples could be cited but these will suffice to demonstrate that Mr. Finn often sees significance in events in the lives of these cardinals which has little or no relation to the real circumstances in which they occurred.

Beyond an excessive tendency to edification and the reading of far deeper meanings into facts than they warrant, the author at times gives expression to judgments which are either mere wild guesses or plain distortions. For example, he relates how Bishop Dubois of New York was interested in getting the famous Dominican preacher, Lacordaire, to come to New York. This simple fact leads him to the following: "Had Lacordaire come to New York, he would almost certainly have succeeded Bishop Dubois, and the militant Archbishop Hughes might have been lost to a field in which he excelled" (p. 26). The choice of a successor to Dubois in New York was a matter of common consultation among the American bishops of that time and there is not the slighted assurance of any kind that the bishops assembled in the Third Provincial Council of Baltimore in April, 1837, who chose John Hughes as coadjutor to Dubois, would have fixed upon Lacordaire. Again, in speaking of Cardinal Gibbons and his part in the founding of the Catholic University of America, Mr. Finn has Bishop Spalding of Peoria "returned from Rome with the Papal approval of a plan for organizing the projected university" (p. 57). Bishop Spalding had nothing to do with securing papal approval of the University. True, he worked consistently for a university years before the Third Plenary Council of 1884, but the approval of Leo XIII was secured by Bishops Keane and Ireland in 1887. Moreover, the author wrongly credits Cardinal Gibbons as placing "his influence wholeheartedly behind the idea," immediately after Spalding's alleged return from Rome (p. 57). Actually the University never had a more energetic and effective supporter *after* its founding than Cardinal Gibbons, but to repre-

sent the Archbishop of Baltimore as taking a leading role in initiating the project is at complete variance with the facts. Gibbons was in reality luke-warm toward the idea until it was strongly insisted upon by others and when it came time for the vote of the American hierarchy as to the site of the Universtiy he voted for it to be located at Philadelphia as he did not, at that time, wish to have it in his own archdiocese. In another connection the account of Cardinal Gibbons is misleading. Gibbons never pronounced as to the doctrinal soundness of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* (p. 63). The concern of the Cardinal of Baltimore was mainly that the Church should not make the mistake of giving to George's book a notice it did not deserve by placing it on the Index. The familiar error of stating that the Canadian hierarchy examined the Knights of Labor and "placed the knights under the ecclesiastical ban" is made here (p. 61). The Canadian hierarchy—and that chiefly Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec—asked Rome to examine the Knights as a secret society, and the Holy Office—not the Canadian bishops—issued the ban. When Cardinal Farley issued public protests against the persecution of the Church by the government of the French Republic in 1905 he was doing what one might legitimately expect of him and the late Archbishop of New York would be the last to claim that "there is no doubt but that they were a factor in causing the French Parliament to abandon the enactment of further legislation along the same line" (p. 84). Likewise to credit Cardinal Farley as being—with the exception of Cardinal O'Connell—"the most important factor in the early success of Maryknoll" (p. 91), is to ignore completely the part played by Cardinal Gibbons in helping Fathers Walsh and Price, a service which the correspondence in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives makes quite clear that they regarded as paramount. On the same page Cardinal Farley is credited with writing the *Life of Cardinal McCloskey.* Since Cardinal Farley's name appears on the title page of that volume, Mr. Finn could hardly be blamed for assigning this credit, although the book was actually written by the late Msgr. Peter Guilday. Speaking of Fr. William O'Connell in Rome as rector of the American College, Finn says: "Not since Cardinal McCloskey had been in Rome as a postgraduate student, had an American priest become so well acquainted with the methods of the curia, with the prelates who directed the government of the Church, and with the members of the laity who were prominent in affairs" (pp. 103 f.). William O'Connell's predecessor in the Roman rectorship, Denis J. O'Connell, enjoyed for ten years before the former's arrival in Rome in 1895 as rector an intimacy with the officials of the Holy See which excelled that of any American priest in the nineteenth century. Chicagoans who are *not* disciples of Colonel McCormick's *Tribune* will

hardly agree with the assertion that their region of the country has "such extreme provincialism [as] exists nowhere else—not even in France, much less in New England" (p. 154). Would one be too squeamish to demur at reading that in the presence of Cardinal Hayes "one had a sense of being very definitely in the presence of a loving God" (p. 185)? Nor is it in any way in accordance with the facts to say of Bishop Cheverus of Boston that "It was he who was largely responsible for the founding of the community at Emmitsburg" by Mother Seton (p. 205). This is to ignore entirely the real founders of the Sisters of Charity there, namely, the Sulpicians of Baltimore. While Bishop Verot of Savannah was an admirable character, indeed, he could hardly be rightly called "saintly" (p. 237), nor would the local pride of the Catholics of Savannah cause them to concur in characterizing their substantial and pleasing cathedral as "magnificent" (p. 239). Mr. Finn succumbs altogether too much to the urge for flamboyant adjectives and these are but two examples. While Cardinal Persico was an able agent of the Holy See it is exaggeration to describe him as "one of the most astute ecclesiastical diplomats of modern times" (p. 248), just as it is such to call Cheverus "one of the most fervent ascetics of modern times" (p. 219). The insult implied by Mr. Finn as offered by Bishops Ireland and Keane to Francesco Satolli (p. 267) is quite gratuitous; merely because the American bishops made inquiry about Satolli as a prospective professor for the new University at Washington does not warrant the author in implying that their failure to engage him was a serious personal offence. If Archbishop Satolli "possessed a capacity for comprehending the true American spirit far beyond that acquired by most natives of the United States" (p. 263), it must be said sadly that he singularly failed to exercise that capacity during his residence in this country, and it is little short of fantastic to credit Satolli with having crushed Cahenslyism in the Church of the United States (p. 276).

The long and distinguished episcopate of Cardinal Glennon in St. Louis was sufficiently rich in deeds to provide Mr. Finn with telling facts without the need to resort to the preposterous device of bringing in the Gallery of Living Catholic Authors, located in the Archdiocese of St. Louis, and characterizing it as "in a sense the Catholic literary center of the world" (p. 418 f.). If it be such we can only say that Catholic literature is in a worse plight than we had imagined! Were space to allow, the reviewer might cite numerous other examples of exaggeration, faulty judgment, false accreditation, and downright historical errors. But enough has been said here to permit the reader to glean something of the spirit and content of Mr. Finn's volume.

Finally, the following errors and misprints were noticed in the read-

ing of the book. Indianapolis is an archdiocese, not a diocese (p. 21); Bishop Whelan of Richmond had as his first name "Richard," not "Vincent" (p. 33); two—not three—of Cardinal Gibbons' sisters were born in Ireland (p. 46); Gibbons was named to Baltimore in 1877, not 1878, so it could not be "almost exactly two years" after his sermon at the consecration of the cathedral there in May, 1876 (p. 53); Gibbons was not chancellor of the Second Plenary Council in 1866; the chancellor was Thomas Foley, later Coadjutor Bishop of Chicago (p. 55); Will, the biographer of Gibbons, is spelled "Wills" (pp. 69 f.); *Quadragesimo* is misspelled (p. 163); Cardinal Hinsley was not "Primate of all England" (p. 166); it was the British East India Company, not the "West" India Company that had been the principal governing element in India in the early years of British occupation (p. 229); the Third Plenary Council was held in 1884, not 1886 (p. 243); there is a misprint of "members" (p. 245); Perugia was a diocese, not an archdiocese (pp. 263, 264); read "ebony" for "ebon" (p. 282); "challenge" for "challange" (p. 447); "encyclical" for "ehcyclical" (p. 454). The bibliography—a very odd assortment of thirty some items—has an entire line reprinted (p. 465). One wonders just what the English translation of Pastor's *History of the Popes* might have had to do with these American prelates when it is noted that Volume XXIV, which Mr. Finn indicates was the last one he used, dealt with Pope Clement VIII (1592-1605)!

There can be no question but that Mr. Finn expended a great deal of time and labor in writing this book, and for that he should be given full credit. Since this is the case it is all the more the pity that he did not strive for more exactness of expression and less effort at times to force the facts beyond what they would allow. The lives of these cardinals—told in a straightforward manner—will win the admiration of all fair-minded men, but when the history of the Church and churchmen is written in so pronouncedly eulogistic a vein there is the gravest danger that it will miss its mark and end by doing a disservice to Catholic history in general. True, Mr. Finn was writing a popular work and, therefore, we would have no right to expect the heavy documentation that accompanies scholarly productions. It would likewise be unfair for the professional church historian to expect a newspaper man to show all the techniques of the historical guild in the same way that it would be unjust to expect the historian to reveal all the clever devices which make the journalist's profession so interesting a one. But there are a number of examples of newspaper men who have written good popular history and Mr. Finn himself employs the work of one of them, namely Allen Sinclair Will's *Life of Cardinal Gibbons*. The two things are not incompatible, and if Mr. Finn should

decide to use again his proven ability for writing pleasing prose in the field of American Catholic history, he can easily produce popular works which will fill a real need if a stricter fidelity to facts and less of a tendency to a sort of forced edification characterize his pages.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

THE BIBLE AND EARLY MAN. By Humphrey J. T. Johnson. New York: Declan X. McMullan Inc., 1948. Pp. ix + 158. $2.25.

The purpose of this book is to reconcile the findings of modern science regarding primitive man with the account of human origins found in the first part of Genesis. The author is a priest of the Oratory, who has thoroughly familiarized himself with the discoveries of anthropology and is convinced that the scriptural history of early man must and can be interpreted in a new way to avoid irreconcilable differences between the Bible and science. His orthodoxy is above suspicion; in fact, he displays at all times a conscientious regard for the definitions and enactments of the Church.

After stating the problem in the first chapter, the author outlines briefly the history of the theory of evolution and the controversy centering about its acceptance in Catholic and Protestant circles. Like many other Catholics, he believes that the body of man evolved in some way from lower forms of life and received a soul from the hands of the Creator when the proper stage of development had been reached.

The third chapter is devoted to a succinct, non-technical analysis of the remains of ancient man thus far discovered. The author concludes, on the basis of the evidence adduced, that there must have some evolution, but cautiously does not attempt to define the stages of this evolution.

In the fourth chapter the two accounts of Genesis on creation are studied. It is not a detailed philological analysis; the author merely emphasizes those features which bear on his problem. He finds that Genesis is not opposed to a moderate theory of evolution, such as is upheld by reputable Catholic theologians. However, he does not explain adequately how this theory is to be harmonized with Gen. *2:7*. Moreover, he flounders about helplessly when he tries to show how Eve may have evolved from Adam, ultimately preferring to leave the problem unsolved. In this respect, he is merely imitating the example of other Catholic evolutionists.

The fifth chapter is dedicated to a discussion of the biblical narrative about the Fall of Man. A laudable effort is made to correlate the features of the scriptural story with the meager data of science con-

cerning primitive man. But since these are themselves tentative and obscure, a satisfying synthesis is not achievable in the present state of our knowledge. The author inclines to the opinion that the pertinent sections of Genesis contain allegorical elements, a view which is certainly not heterodox.

The sixth chapter is especially useful for its evaluation of the scientific evidence concerning the unity of the human race. The question whether the human race descended from one pair or from a group of rational animals is discussed but not satisfactorily resolved. The author seems to think that the Bible is concerned primarily with man's spiritual history, without throwing any light on the problems with which physical anthropology concerns itself (p. 121).

The seventh chapter, which deals with the early ages of the world, contains some excellent remarks on the interpretation of the table of nations in Genesis. But the following explanations of biblical episodes will strike the exegete as somewhat farfetched: the story of Cain and Abel is merely a primitive way of saying that agricultural peoples were more powerful than pastoral ones; Cain's murder of Abel is a reminder of the hostility displayed by the settled agriculturists towards the pastoral nomads; the fact that Jubal, the first musician, is the brother of Jabal, the owner of flocks and herds, is perhaps a hint that music took its origin from the custom of piping after the flocks; Abel and Cain may represent nations rather than individuals. The author, also, believes that Cain may merely be a type of the homicide in general and attempts to prove this from the mark set upon him. But this mark is susceptible of a totally different explanation, as every interpreter knows. Johnson's attempt to attribute a symbolic significance to the ages of the ancient patriarchs cannot be pronounced successful, whatever the explanation of these baffling ages may be. The eighth chapter, which takes up the deluge, is surprisingly superficial and correspondingly unsatisfactory.

In short, then, this book presents the scientific difficulties in an up-to-date fashion, for which it is to be recommended to theologians and exegetes, who need a summary and trustworthy statement of the results of modern research. Its efforts to solve the problems are praiseworthy and stimulating but hardly more than suggestions, more or less acceptable. We lay down the book with the feeling that a satisfactory reconciliation of Genesis and science still awaits further discovery and research.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

A Manual of Prayers and Services for the Use of Romanian-American Catholics of Byzantine Rite. Cleveland, Ohio: The Romanian Catholic Publishing Company of America, 1946. Pp. xii + 693.

This beautiful prayer book gives an English translation of the various Romanian prayers and devotions that it contains and a Romanian translation along with the English original of many other prayers. Hence it can be used equally by those who are more familiar with the Romanian language and those who are more at home in English. In a foreword the committee in charge of preparing and publishing the work states its need and purpose. Knowledge of the Romanian language grows progressively less among Americans of Romanian descent. "Nevertheless, they belong to our Church, in which the liturgical services are carried on in the Romanian language, according to the special rite approved by the Holy Apostolic See. In order that they might understand these services and benefit by them in accordance with the intention and desire of the Church, we have published this manual of prayers in two languages. . . . Thus we hope to keep our younger generation united to the Church of their forefathers, as well as preserve our Catholic Byzantine-rite (sometimes known as Greek-Catholic) parishes in America."

Contained in this volume are daily prayers, the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, the Liturgy of St. Basil, explanations of the sacraments and material for their reception, meditations, special prayers for various occasions and purposes, passages from the liturgy for different seasons and feast days, the devotional service of the Mother of God, and much else. There is a fine statement of the nature of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and also a clear explanation of Christian faith and practice. Among the many prayers familiar to the Latin rite that are given are the Rosary and the Stations of the Cross. As this reviewer does not know any Romanian, he must confine himself to the English half of the book. The English that is used throughout the work is excellent: it is at once clear, forceful, dignified, and devotional in character.

In addition to its services to Catholics of the Byzantine rite, this prayer book may serve to bring to the attention of others some of the wonderful prayers that it contains. As instances of them we will quote two. The first is from the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. It reads: "We thank thee, Lord, lover of men, benefactor of our souls, that thou hast made us worthy of thy heavenly and undying Sacraments. Straighten our path; strengthen us in thy fear; protect our lives; give strength to our steps, through the prayers and intercession of the glorious Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, and of all thy Saints." A prayer from the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil in honor of the Blessed